



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

204

**CWP-8297-1996 (O&M)
Date of decision: 25.09.2024**

BHARAT SINGH (DIED) THROUGH ITS LRPETITIONER

Vs.

**BHIWANI COOPERATIVE BANK LTD., BHIWANI THROUGH ITS MD
AND OTHERS ...RESPONDENTS**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Mukul Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Sihag, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 01.02.1995 (Annexure P-5) whereby Labour Court has dismissed application of the petitioner under Section 33-C(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

2. The petitioner was dismissed from service by respondent No. 1-bank in 1968. He preferred an application before Labour Authorities and matter came up for consideration before Labour Court which vide Award dated 29.08.1972 (Annexure P-1) ordered to reinstate him with continuity of service and full back wages. The respondents preferred CWP-1120-1973 before this Court which was disposed of on 03.02.1982. The petitioner preferred Contempt Petition No. 59 of 1982 before this Court which was disposed of on 30.08.1982. He filed an application under Section 33-C(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

which was partially allowed by Labour Court. He filed second application under

Section 33-C(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 claiming a sum of Rs. 2,952/- i.e. wages payable during the suspension period. The currency of suspension period was 01.11.1967 to 13.06.1968. He also claimed refund of security, bonus and Employer’s Provident Fund contribution.

3. The Labour Court by impugned order dated 01.02.1995 has dismissed his application forming an opinion that claim of petitioner *qua* bonus and Employer’s Provident Fund contribution has already been rejected in the previous application and he is unable to prove his claim *qua* refund of security. The claim of his wages during suspension period has also been rejected.

4. Considering the amount involved i.e. Rs. 2952/- and categorical findings of Labour Court, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke its extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

5. Dismissed.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

25.09.2024
manoj

[JAGMOHAN BANSAL]
JUDGE

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