



\$~68

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 12.12.2024

+

W.P.(C) 17174/2024, CM APPL. 72883/2024 & CM APPL. 72882/2024 (stay)

M/S GYAN SALES CORPORATION

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Parminder Singh Goindi,
Advocate

versus

RAJENDRA PRASAD

.....Respondent

Through: None

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The petitioner management has assailed order dated 14.08.2024 passed by the competent authority under the Delhi Shops and Establishment Act 1954, thereby directing the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.29,400/- towards due earned wages and a compensation of Rs. 5,000/- to the present respondent workman. Having heard the learned counsel for petitioner and having examined the record, I do not find it a fit case to issue notice to respondent workman.

2. Briefly stated, the present respondent workman filed a claim application under Section 21(2) of the Act on 23.01.2023 pleading that he

W.P.(C) 17174/2024


Page 1 of 3 pages

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

Digitaly signed by GIRSH KATHPALIA
 DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=DELHI HIGH COURT,
 2.5.4.20=B401d889b27a77b265ffmfa4efac5569af3962cf8b4835d
 4339f7626acca, postalCode=110003, st=DELHI,
 serialNumber=D3E86796451EC45C0785D15570996B40F80C8D2EE
 E60402C482796FF801E26FA, cn=GIRSH KATHPALIA
 Date: 2024.12.13 12:03:43 +0500

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By:NEETUN NAIR
Signing Date:12.12.2024
17:16:58



3. On behalf of petitioner management, it is contended by learned counsel that on 14.08.2024, none appeared on behalf of petitioner because the petitioner was under a bonafide impression that the matter pertained to another similar dispute between the parties. This submission of learned counsel for petitioner fails to convince because as mentioned above, admittedly summons were duly served on the petitioner, after which the petitioner appeared on 28.02.2023 and was supplied copy of claim application and thereafter also, the matter was repeatedly adjourned but none appeared on behalf of petitioner. Even in the application dated 07.10.2024 (*pdf 40*) filed by the petitioner management before the competent authority seeking setting aside of the ex-parte order impugned in the present case,



2024:DHC:9608



there is no denial qua service of summons followed by appearance of petitioner before the competent authority. There is no other challenge to the impugned order.

4. The impugned order was passed on the basis of unchallenged application and evidence. The petitioner management having opted to abandon the proceedings after participating on one date cannot now seek setting aside of the impugned order.

5. I am unable to find any infirmity in the impugned order so the same is upheld and the petition as well as the accompanying applications are dismissed.

**GIRISH
KATHPALIA**

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
ou=DELHI HIGH COURT,
2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65ffffe4afe
c45569af3962c6fb4835d435f97626cacca,
postalCode=110003, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=D3E86796451EC45C07B5D
15570996B40F80CBD2EEE60402C487965
FF801E26FA, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2024.12.12 17:03:23 -08'00'

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J.

DECEMBER 12, 2024/as

Click here to check corrigendum, if any