

2024.PHHC.076612



CWP No. 1178 of 2024

Date of Decision:29.05.2024

Sandeep Sangwan

....Petitioner

vs.

Bank of India and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate  
for the petitionerMr. Tarlok, Advocate for  
Mr. Gaurav Goel, Advocate  
for the respondents-Bank

\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. On 19.01.2024, the following order was passed by this Court:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that petitioner has not been extended benefit of gratuity on the ground that he has not completed minimum requisite period of five years. The petitioner has worked with respondent-bank for four years and nine months and as per Section 2A(2)(a)(ii) of Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 read with judgment of Madras High Court in **Mettur Beardsell, Ltd. (represented by its Personnel Manager), Madras v.Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) (Appellate Authority under Payment of Gratuity Act), Madras, 1996 SCC OnLine Mad 344**, if an employee completes period of 240 days, it is*



*considered as one year, thus, petitioner has completed service of five years and he is entitled to payment of gratuity.*

*Notice of motion returnable for 13.05.2024.*

*Mr. Teginder Singh, Advocate, who on advance notice is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and seeks time to file reply and address the arguments.*

*To be shown in urgent.”*

- 2. Mr. Tarlok, Advocate, at the outset, submits that respondents are going to release gratuity alongwith interest @ 10% per annum in favour of the petitioner.
- 3. Counsel for the petitioner agrees to the aforesaid arrangement.
- 4. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petition stands disposed of.

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**29.05.2024**  
paramjit

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