

2024:PHHC:096130



CWP-7573-1999 (O&M) 1

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

207

CWP-7573-1999 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 30.07.2024

SURINDER PAL SINGH

.... PETITIONER

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, PANIPAT AND ORS RESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. There was no representation on behalf of petitioner on
18.07.2024 and the following order was passed :

“1. Application filed by the petitioner – Surinder Pal Singh, under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short, ‘ID Act’), for recovery of Rs.56,545.90 (Rupees Fifty Six Thousand Five Hundred Forty Five and Ninety Paise only), was dismissed by holding that there is no jurisdiction with it and the application ought to have been filed before the learned Labour Court at Rohtak, which according to the view point of the Presiding Officer of the Labour Court, Panipat, was having the jurisdiction to decide the claim of the petitioner.

Unfortunately plea of the employee/workman raised through application No.48 of 1993 for recovery of the amount was dismissed on the ground of jurisdiction on 05.05.1999 i.e. after 5/6 years.

2. Still, by expecting early decision of his claim, petitioner filed the present writ petition before this Court in



CWP-7573-1999 (O&M) 2

the year 1999, but same was admitted by the Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 11.10.2000, without even fixing any actual date of its hearing to decide the issue of jurisdiction.

3. *On 05.05.2015, when the matter came up for its hearing before the Permanent Lok Adalat of this Court, notice was issued to Mr. Rajesh Garg, Sr. Advocate, counsel for the petitioner at # 2070, Sector 21-C, Chandigarh for 29.06.2015.*

However, on 29.06.2015, Permanent Lok Adalat noted and recorded in its order that notice has been received back unserved, as the address was not found.

4. *Adjourned to 30.07.2024.*

Registry is directed to inform Mr. Rajesh Garg, Sr. Advocate, counsel for the petitioner, about the next date fixed in the matter.

If the address given in the petition has changed, the Registry will find out the new address and contact number of the learned counsel, for the purpose of informing him about the next date fixed in the matter.

Let a notice and copy of today's order be also sent to the petitioner at the address mentioned in the writ petition."

2. As per office report, Mr. Rajesh Garg, Sr. Advocate has been informed, however, there is no representation.

3. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

4. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

30.07.2024

anju

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

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