

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

102

CR No.700 of 2021

Date of Decision:22.03.2021

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

M/s Ebro India (Private Limited) and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Anju Katyal

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Ms. Harmanpreet Kaur (Simmi), Advocate,
for the revisionist-petitioners.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

The revisionist-petitioners have assailed the order Annexure P-1 passed by learned Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Panipat on 12.02.2021, whereby their evidence in the Reference between the parties as pending before it, has been ordered to be closed.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the revisionist-petitioners in this revision petition at the preliminary stage.

3. Learned counsel for the revisionist-petitioners requests that another opportunity be afforded to the revisionist-petitioners to adduce their evidence before the said Court/Tribunal as they could not

conclude it earlier due to some exceptional and unavoidable circumstances.

4. However, a bare perusal of the impugned order Annexure P-1 reveals that the Presiding Officer has mentioned therein that in the zimni order passed on 22.01.2021, it was specifically observed that the revisionist-petitioners (arrayed as respondents in the said Reference) had failed to conclude their evidence despite availing 22 effective opportunities and the case was adjourned to 12.02.2021 while granting last opportunity to them for concluding their evidence but as is categorically mentioned in the said impugned order, on that day also, MW-1 Vishal Sehgal, examined by the revisionist-petitioners in their evidence, had failed to appear in the Court for his cross-examination.

5. Further Annexure P-2, containing the copies of the zimni orders passed by the said Court/Tribunal during the period from 25.08.2017 till the date of the passing the impugned order, also supports the said observation of the Court/Tribunal regarding the revisionist-petitioners having already been granted as many as 22 effective opportunities to conclude their evidence.

6. To add to it, no plausible and cogent reasons have been put-forth by the revisionist-petitioners for not concluding their evidence despite availing the afore-mentioned opportunities, so as to justify the grant of any further opportunity to them for leading their evidence.

7. As a sequel to the foregoing discussion, it follows that the impugned order dated 12.02.2021 (Annexure P-1) does not suffer from

any illegality, irregularity or perversity and hence, the same does not call for any interference by this Court. Resultantly, the present revision petition is, hereby, dismissed.

22.03.2021
hemlata

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No