

CWP-12932-1998

- 1 -

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

206

CWP-12932-1998

Decided on : 02.04.2024

Rajinder Kumar Sharma

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

Orient Steel & Industries Ltd. and another

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: None for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner – Rajinder Kumar Sharma, has filed the present writ petition for seeking quashing of the order dated 13.06.1996 (Annexure P-1), whereby, learned Labour Court-II, Faridabad, partly allowed the application filed by the workman (petitioner herein), to the extent of holding his entitlement for a sum of Rs.9,620/- only.

2. Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, Advocate, for respondent No.1 – M/s Orient Steel & Industries Ltd., informs the Court that there is nothing substantial in the present writ petition that necessitates its adjudication, at this stage, more for the reason that the working in the industry was closed down even prior to the year of 2016.

3. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner, rather, the attempt made by the Daily Lok Adalat of apprising the petitioner about the pendency of present writ petition had also failed. As per order dated 09.12.2016, passed by learned Daily Lok Adalat, notices issued were

CWP-12932-1998

- 2 -

received back unserved with the report 'unknown and no such addressee'.

For convenience, order dated 09.12.2016, is reproduced here-under also:-

"Daily Lok Adalat" **Bench No.1**
506 **CWP No. 12932 of 1998**
RAJINDER KUMAR SHARMA V/S ORIENT STEEL &
INDUSTRIES ETC

Present: None
for the petitioner

None
for the respondent

* * * *

As per the office report, notice issued to the petitioner has been received back unserved with the report 'unknown and no such addressee'. We have no other alternative address of the petitioner. In these circumstances, we have no option but to send the case back to the Hon'ble High Court for adjudication.

(R.C.Kathuria)
President

(Arvind Kumar)
Member

09.12.2016"

4. Since, no one resides at the address mentioned in the memo of parties of the present writ petition, no purpose would be served by issuing the fresh notice to the petitioner.

5. In such circumstances, this Court is left with no other option except to dispose of the writ petition for want of prosecution.

6. **Dismissed for want of prosecution.**

However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an appropriate application for seeking revival of the present writ petition,

CWP-12932-1998

- 3 -

within eight weeks from today, in case, any substantive issue still exists along with a cause of action to the petitioner.

A copy of this order be also forwarded to the petitioner at the address mentioned in the present writ petition.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 02, 2024
J.Ram

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