

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

Sr. No.250

CWP No.1643 of 2019

Date of Decision: 19.05.2022

Rajbir

.... Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director, Sugar Fed, Haryana
and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. B.S.Tewatia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Narender Singh Behgal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Himanshu Bansal, Advocate for

Mr. Sachin Gupta Ladwa, Advocate for respondent No.2.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

The present petition involves disputed questions of law as the petitioner is raising the issue that the petitioner had applied for the leave which was declined. As per the petitioner, he is entitled for 30 days' earned leave encashment whereas the respondent in its reply has stated that no leave application was ever submitted by the petitioner to claim the leave in question, hence, grant of the benefit as being claimed in this petition does not arise. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not rebutted the said averment by way of replication.

Keeping in view the fact that the present petition involves disputed questions of law and under Article 226 of Constitution of India, this Court can not go into deciding the disputed question of fact, the present petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy for the redressal of his grievance at the appropriate forum.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

19.05.2022

Maninder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No