

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

207

**CR No.692 of 2013(O&M)
Date of Decision:19.7.2019**

PUNJAB STATE CIVIL SUPPLIES CORP. LTD. AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Versus

MOHINDER SINGH AND ORS

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr.Naresh Gopal Sharma, Advocate for
Mr.Mehardeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Khungar, Advocate
for the respondents.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

The authority under the Payment of Wages Act has passed the order dated 25.2.2008, thereby holding that the payments have been wrongly withheld by the petitioners and the respondents are entitled to interest @ 9% per annum on the amount of ₹ 85,115/- from the date of filing of application till final realization of the amount.

The petitioners were directed to make payment of the aforesaid amount of ₹ 85,115/- to the respondents along with interest @ 9% per annum from the date of application till its realization along with costs of ₹ 1000/-. The aforesaid order dated 25.2.2008 was unsuccessfully challenged before the

Appellate authority. The Appellate authority dismissed the appeal of the petitioners vide order dated 4.5.2012.

Admittedly, the paddy was subject matter in a criminal case. The case set up by the respondents was that they did the refilling of the bags and thus were entitled for the remuneration for which their claim was accepted. The factum of work done has not been denied by the petitioners. If the paddy was delivered to the petitioners in a good condition, the petitioners cannot be permitted to rake up any issue of authorization for the work done. The factum of delivery of paddy to the petitioners cannot be denied, though the same was ordered to be auctioned from some godown. Auction of paddy under the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court would not affect the rights of the respondents for the claim which was decreed for the work done by them.

At this stage, this Court is not obliged to go for any other detail, except to appreciate that after getting the work from the respondents, the petitioners cannot turn around and deny their liability to pay the respondents their dues.

Accordingly, this revision petition is dismissed.

July 19, 2019

anita

Whether reasoned/speaking

Whether reportable

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Yes/No

Yes/No