

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

CWP No.17612 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.11.2021

Glaxo Smithkline Consumer Healthcare Ltd

.....Petitioner

Versus

P.O Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Patiala & Anr.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present: Mr. Abhivadya Sood, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Pannu, Advocate for

Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J

Petitioner had challenged the award dated 08.04.2019 passed by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Patiala vide which termination order dated 14.05.2012 of respondent No.2 was modified to punishment of stoppage of two increments with cumulative effect. His non-duty period from the date of termination i.e 14.05.2012 till the date of his reinstatement was directed to be treated as non duty period or leave of the kind due. It was also directed that respondent No.2 would be entitled to other consequential benefits of his service as if termination order dated 14.05.2012 has not been passed. The awarded amount was required to be paid to respondent No.2 within 45 days of the publication of the award.

It is the case of the petitioner that during the pendency of the present petition, an settlement (P.8) has been arrived at vide which respondent No.2 has agreed to accept a sum of Rs.9,60,000/- from the management as full and final settlement of all his claims and disputes.

Besides, a sum of Rs.1,45,452/- was to be received by respondent No.2-

workman qua all his claims including wages, suspension allowance, bonus, overtime wages, leave with wages, service compensation and gratuity amount of Rs.1,21,963/-. A personal loan amount of Rs.62,000/- being payable by the workman was to be deducted before disbursement of the settled amount. In furtherance of the settlement, three bank drafts (P.9) were prepared, which have been received by respondent No.2, who in token thereof has issued receipt (P.10). Said receipt has also been acknowledged by two persons.

Sh. Pannu, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 states that respondent No.2 has not contacted them since long.

It appears that respondent No.2 has settled the dispute with the petitioner-management and having received the entire amount in the light of settlement (P.8), he is no longer interested in contesting the matter.

In view thereof, present writ petition is disposed of in terms of the settlement (P.8). If respondent No.2 disputes the settlement, it would be open to him to file an appropriate application.

November 08, 2021
manoj

(Harinder Singh Sidhu)
Judge

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