



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-9783-1998 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 18.05.2024

M/S PRINT CRAFT PRESS THROUGH SH. DIVESH NATH
.....PETITIONER
VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE SECRETARY TO GOVT
HRY AND ORS
.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Praveen Chander Goyal, Additional A.G. Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Petitioner – M/s Print Craft Press has filed present writ petition for assailing the order dated 30.12.1997 (Annexure P-6), whereby application No.16 of 1995 filed by Labour Inspector, Circle – 4, Faridabad, under Minimum Wages Act, 1948, has been allowed.

For reference, relevant clause of the said impugned order is reproduced here under:-

“RELIEF

I accept the claim as filed by the applicant except with little variation in compensation. I direct the respondent that he shall deposit the wage and compensation as allowed by me under issue no. 2 for disbursement to the following workmen/employees. The deposit shall be made within the time allowed. If the respondent fails to deposit the wage and compensation in the time allowed them from 1-3-1998 on wards the respondent shall also pay 18%p. Simple interest on the total amount or the amount remains balance after the last date of deposit i.e. 28-2-1998.

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Name of the worker/ employee</i>	<i>Amount of wage awarded</i>	<i>Compensation awarded</i>
1.	<i>Sh. Budh Ram</i>	<i>Rs.1125-00</i>	<i>9000-00</i>
2.	<i>Sh. Rajbir</i>	<i>Rs.1500-00</i>	<i>12000-00</i>
3.	<i>Sh. Sunil Kumar</i>	<i>Rs.1200-00</i>	<i>9600-00</i>
4.	<i>Sh. Jaldhar</i>	<i>Rs.1350-00</i>	<i>10800-00</i>
5.	<i>Sh. Deep Kumar</i>	<i>Rs.1200-00</i>	<i>9600-00</i>
6.	<i>Sh. Subhash Ram</i>	<i>Rs.1200-00</i>	<i>9600-00</i>
<i>Total.</i>		<i>Rs.7575-00</i>	<i>6060 Rs.68175/-</i>

2. As a matter of fact, counsel for the petitioner who filed present writ petition was elevated to the Bench of this Court and thereafter, as per office note, notice issued to the petitioner is received back “**unserved**”, and as per the statement of Hement, Manager of Delhi Press “*no such company available there of this name*”.

Otherwise also, petitioner is challenging the inspection done by the Labour Inspector in regard to the compliance of the provisions of Minimum Wages Act, 1948.

3. On the previous date of hearing, none was present on behalf of the petitioner and today also, there is no representation on his behalf.

Present writ petition is pending before the Court, since the year 1998 i.e. for the last about more than 25 years.

4. Since, there is no one to assist the Court and it is not certain whether any cause of action still survives, this Court is left with no other option, except to dispose of the present writ petition as the same being not prosecuted.

5. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

6. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an appropriate application for seeking revival of the present writ petition, within eight weeks from today, in case, any substantive issue still exists along with a cause of action to the petitioner.
7. Let copy of this order be forwarded at the address of the petitioner, mentioned in the present writ petition.

18.05.2024
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ✓ Yes/~~No~~

Whether reportable ~~Yes~~/✓ No