

110

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-13274-2019

Date of Decision:18.01.2024

NEETU

..... Petitioner

Versus

BANK OF BARODA AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Dr. Sumati Jund, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.B. Bagga, Advocate
for the respondents.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. On 11.01.2024, the following order was passed:

*“Learned counsel for the respondents submits that petitioner has remedy to approach Industrial Tribunal against the impugned order.
Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks time to verify factual as well as legal position.
Adjourned to 18.01.2024.
To be shown in the **Urgent List.**”*
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner expressed her inability to controvert the fact that petitioner has remedy to approach Industrial Tribunal against the impugned order, however, she submits that Tribunal may be directed to decide her appeal on merits.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that he has no objection, if Tribunal is directed to decide appeal of the petitioner on merits.

4. As the petitioner has alternative and efficacious remedy against the impugned order, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke its extra writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. In the wake of of statements of both side, the petition is disposed of with liberty to petitioner to approach the Industrial Tribunal. If the petitioner files appeal before Industrial Tribunal within 4 weeks from today, it would be decided on merits.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

18.01.2024
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>