



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

**Review Application No. LP-74 of 2024
In Letters Patent Appeal No. 22 of 2023**

Date of Decision: 02.12.2024

Puneet Duggal

... Applicant(s)

Versus

Marriott Hotels India Private Limited and Another

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sheel Nagu, Chief Justice.
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.**

Present: Mr. Puneet Duggal, Review Applicant, in person.

Ms. Rupa Pathania and Mr. Aayush Chandra, Advocates
for the respondents.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. The appellant seeks review of the judgment dated 28.08.2024. His Letters Patent Appeal was allowed on 28.08.2024. At the time of arguments, he has brought the attention of the Court to certain inadvertent printing errors which are not disputed by the learned counsel representing the non-applicant. Hence, the following printing errors are corrected:-

- I) In para 1.1 of the judgment, the correct date of the judgment and order passed by the learned Single Judge is “28.05.2021” and not “28.05.2024”.
- II) The applicant/appellant also prays that the payments mentioned in para 2.3C are incorrect. It is the reproduction of the contention of the learned counsel representing the respondents, hence, cannot be corrected.

- III) In para 3.9 of the judgment, the spellings of Ms. Ruchi Verma are “Ms.Ruchi Varma” and not “Verma”.
- IV) In para 3.16, the date of payment of retrenchment compensation is “22.05.2015” and not “29.05.2015”.
2. The appellant admitted that he has been reinstated in service pursuant to the judgment passed by this Court. He submits that he is entitled to the consequential seniority. The award passed on 01.08.2017 by the Industrial Court-cum-Labour Court-I, Gurugram, which has not been challenged by the applicant/appellant, reads as under:
- “15. As a result of findings upon the said issues, the present petition is decided in favour of the petitioner/workman directing the respondent to reinstate him within thirty days of receiving the notice of the published Award with the payment of 40% back wages within subsequent fifteen day.”*
3. As already noticed, the applicant/appellant has not filed any writ petition. Now he wants that he should be entitled to seniority and continuation. Since the applicant/appellant never filed any writ petition challenging the concluding portion of the award, hence, he, if so advised, and if it is permissible in law, may file an appropriate application before the Labour Court.
4. With observations made above, the present review application is disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge
December 02, 2024
“DK”

(Sheel Nagu)
Chief Justice

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No