

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

209

CWP-6550-2000(O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.03.2024

BATA INDIA LTD. AND ANR

.... Petitioners

Versus

PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, JALANDHAR AND
ORS

....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Animesh Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.(Oral)

1. Petitioner-Bata India Ltd./Bata Shoe Store, Kashmiri Bazar, Hoshiarpur, filed the present writ petition, assailing the award dated 17.03.1999 passed by learned Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Jalandhar, whereby reference No.456/1995 had been answered in favour of respondent No.2-Amarjit Singh (workman).

2. Learned Labour Court held that respondent No.2-Amarjit Singh (workman), is entitled for reinstatement with continuity of service alongwith full back wages and workman was asked to join the duty within one month after publication of the award.

3. Today, Mr. Animesh Sharma, Advocate, while appearing before this Court submits that the counsel, who filed the present writ petition, has been elevated to the Bench and he has no authority to

make any statement in regard to the development having taken place during the pendency of the present writ petition. However, on the asking of the Court, counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner examined the office record of the earlier counsel and thereafter, stated that it appears that the dispute had been resolved way back in the year, 2011, because in the brief of the case, there is a registered letter forwarded from the office of the petitioner's company at the address of the earlier counsel.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed photocopy of the said letter alongwith some documents regarding settlement of the dispute between the parties i.e. petitioner-Company and respondent No.2-Amarjit Singh. The same are taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place and to mark the page number as well.

4. On perusal of the documents filed by counsel for the petitioner, it is revealed that as agreed between the parties, the petitioner-company has already made payment of Rs.70,000/- as full and final settlement to respondent No.2-Amarjit Singh.

5. From the facts recorded hereabove and the documents placed on record by counsel for the petitioner, it appears that with the efflux of time no cause survives, which may require adjudication. Therefore, it would be appropriate to dispose of the present writ petition as having been rendered infructuous.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous.
7. However, petitioner will be at liberty to move an application for revival of the present writ petition, within eight weeks from today, in case any substantial issue warranting its decision, still survives.

March 18, 2024
rashmi

[SANJAY VASHISTH]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable?

yes/no
yes/no