

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

228

Civil Writ Petition No.24846 of 2015

Date of Decision: August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2019

M/s R.K. Products

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH**

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Dadwal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

**AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)**

Perusal of the records indicate that the counsel for the petitioner has not been appearing in Court since 20.12.2016 nor has he come present today. Reason for non-appearance of counsel for the petitioner has been pointed out by learned counsel for the State of Haryana, who has referred to the reply which has been filed by the State. Para 3 of the said reply reads as follows:-

*“That it is further submitted that the criminal complaint filed by the Labour Inspector came up for hearing before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gurgaon on 31.3.2016 and during the course of hearing the respondent no.4 - workman deposed before the learned trial court that **“as per compromise he has received Rs.96004/- and he gives up his claim of reinstatement and now no due is pending against the management.”** Further, the complainant i.e. Labour Inspector has also made statement before the learned trial court that **“payment has already been made to worker Kamta Prasad Rai today in the Court and lenient view in the matter be taken.”** In view of the statement made by the respondent no.4 – workman as well as the complainant – Labour Inspector, the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate sentenced the accused to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- for the commission of offence punishable under section 29/31 read with section 32 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The learned trial court further ordered if the convict failed to*

*deposit the amount of fine then he shall undergo simple imprisonment for seven days. A copy of order dated 31.3.2016 is attached as Annexure R-1 for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.”*

A perusal of the same would indicate that there has been a compromise between the petitioner and respondent No.4. Since the compromise has already been entered into between the parties and the same has been implemented as well, the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the matter any further.

In view of the above, the writ petition stands disposed of.

**August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2019**  
*Puneet*

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)**  
**JUDGE**

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes |
| Whether Reportable:        | No  |