

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

244

CWP No.18142 of 2017(O&M)
DECIDED ON : 02.03.2020

Lala Pawan Kumar

...Petitioner

versus

Authority Under the Minimum Wages Act and others.

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI

Present : Mr. Gunjan Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Gulati, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 and 3.

GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed by the petitioner-Lala Pawan Kumar, *inter alia*, with the prayer to quash the order dated 20.02.2017 passed by the authority under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (hereinafter called as 'the Act').

Vide order dated 20.02.2017, the petitioner herein was directed to pay Rs.35280/- to each of the applicant i.e. total Rs.70,560/- within 60 days from the date of the order with further directions.

The records of the case show that notice of motion in this case was issued on 17.08.2017.

Today on resumed hearing of the case, learned counsel for respondent No.2 has shown copy of order dated 01.02.2019, passed by the Civil Judge, Sr. Division, Kaithal, wherein it has been recorded that a joint statement was made before that Court that there are chances of compromise between the parties and the case was accordingly adjourned. Learned counsel has further shown copy of statement dated 07.02.2019 recorded by

the Presiding Officer, Lok Adalat, Kaithal, wherein it was recorded that Sh. Mukesh Kumar Nirwani, Advocate had made a statement that he would withdraw the instant matter without prejudice to rights to institute the matter afresh. Hence, same be dismissed as withdrawn. On the same day i.e. 07.02.2019, the Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Kaithal, had passed an order recording that the learned counsel for the decree holder has made a statement that he does not want to proceed further with the matter and seeks to withdraw the same and further requested for granting him permission for filing fresh execution. In view of the statement, the matter was dismissed as withdrawn. The copies of the aforementioned orders are retained on the record. Registry is directed to paginate the same.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 further makes a statement that he has instructions to submit on their behalf that respondents shall not be filing or pursuing any execution of the order dated 20.02.2017 impugned hereunder.

In view of the above, the present writ petition, therefore, has become infructuous and no further orders are called for.

Writ petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

March 02, 2020

jyoti3

**(GIRISH AGNIHOTRI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO
Whether reportable : YES/NO