

CWP-4858-1997

- 1 -

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CWP-4858-1997

Decided on : 14.02.2024

Anait and others

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Gurdaspur and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: None.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner – Anait along with 10 other petitioners, filed present writ petition in the year 1997, for seeking quashing of the award/order dated 11.01.1995, whereby, learned Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Gurdaspur (for brevity, ‘learned Labour Court’), decided 16 applications under Section 33-C (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short, ‘the Act’), for computation of various amounts due to them (applicants) from the Municipality, Pathankot.

There was a claim raised *qua* overtime wages in lieu of weekly rests, over time wages in lieu of National and festival holidays and over time wages in lieu of earned leave etc., for various periods between 1949 to 1979.

2. Learned Labour Court held that the applicants (petitioners herein) before it caused inordinate delay in filing their applications, rather, claim raised by them is false and exaggerated. Accordingly, such applications under Section 33-C (2) of the Act, were dismissed.

Since thereafter, writ petition is pending before this Court and after the same being admitted vide order dated 22.09.1997, none had

CWP-4858-1997

- 2 -

appeared on 01.03.2017, 11.05.2017 and even on the last date of hearing i.e. 06.02.2020.

3. On 06.02.2020, while adjourning the case, following order was passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court:-

“Present: None for the parties.

There is no representation on behalf of the parties.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 25.03.2020.

It is made clear that in case no one appears on behalf of the parties on the next date of hearing, an appropriate order will be passed.”

4. As per office note dated 08.02.2024 also, counsel has been informed through email. But despite that, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioners.

Thus, in such circumstances, this Court is left with no other option, except to dispose of present writ petition, as same being not prosecuted.

Dismissed for want of prosecution.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

February 14, 2024

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No