

CWP-14767-1997
Date of decision: 08.04.2024

...Petitioner

HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD AND OTHERS
...Respondents

Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Mayank Gupta, Advocate
for the respondents.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is a case where the petitioner was appointed as Apprentice Lineman with effect from 04.10.1994 for a period of two years and thereafter, he served for one more year but the salary for the aforesaid period of one year has not been paid to him although the amount for the apprentice period has been paid to him. He further

submitted that even the petitioner had submitted a representation vide Annexure P-6 but till date no action was taken in this regard.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the petitioner has not come to this Court with clean hands and in fact so far as his period of apprenticeship is concerned, he was duly paid his amount, to which even the petitioner does not dispute the same but a perusal of Annexure P-4 and Annexure P-7 would show that the petitioner has attached some certificates issued by the SDO/SDE, Israna, whereas he has never worked at the aforesaid place i.e. Israna and his apprenticeship was only at Naultha and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for any other amount.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

5. The only dispute in the present case is that the petitioner was admittedly appointed as Apprentice Lineman for a period of two years from 04.10.1994 and regarding that period there is no dispute that he has worked and he has been paid but according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner continued working thereafter for another one year and for that period, Annexure P-4 and Annexure P-7 i.e. the certificates were also issued but he has not been paid the salary. However, the case of the learned counsel for the respondents is that the petitioner never worked for that period because even as per Annexure P-4 and Annexure P-7, the certificates have been issued by SDO/SDE, Israna, whereas he never worked at Israna at all and the aforesaid certificates were also fabricated certificates and Annexure P-4 is also undated.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court deems it fit and proper to direct the Superintending Engineer, Panipat to look into the aforesaid issue and after perusing the record to pass an order within a period of

three months from today and in case the petitioner has worked for any period beyond his period of apprenticeship and is found entitled, then the benefits shall be released to him in accordance with law, within a period of three months thereafter. Needless to say that the order which is to be passed by the Superintending Engineer, Panipat shall be a speaking order by referring to the record of the case.

7. Consequently, the present writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

08.04.2024
Chetan Thakur

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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