



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(235)

CWP No. 14879 of 2000 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 10.03.2025

Balwan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Authority under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 at Karnal and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Ms. Devanshi Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner-Labourer is that the claim of the petitioner-Labourer for the release of the wages for the period he had worked with the respondents No. 2 and 3 has not been appreciated correctly and the claim for the release of the wages raised by the petitioner has been declined by the authority concerned.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner-Labourer had worked with the respondents No. 2 and 3 from 22.06.1996 to 01.04.1998 and he was entitled for the minimum wages for a period of one year, which is ₹17,995/-, which has not been paid as only ₹5,000/- were paid by the respondents No. 2 and 3 and the rest of the money was yet to be paid. Learned counsel submits that by the Award dated 13.09.2000 (Annexure P-1)



passed by the authority under the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 may kindly be set-aside.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record with her able assistance.

4. In the present petition, the prayer of the petitioner-Labourer is that the petitioner-Labourer was entitled for the minimum wages for working for one year, which was ₹17,995/-, whereas only ₹5,000/- has been paid to the petitioner-Labourer for working from June, 1996 till April, 1998.

5. As per the material evidence brought on record, the petitioner-Labourer has only worked for a period of 08 months from June, 1997 till February, 1998. Further, as per the Award dated 13.09.2000 (Annexure P-1), the evidence which has been produced by the respondents No. 2 and 3 is that there is a settlement between the petitioner-Labourer and the respondents No. 2 and 3, wherein it has been recorded that the petitioner-Labourer has already received a sum of ₹40,000/- at the time of getting the employment. Even the witnesses which have been produced, supported the aforementioned fact that the petitioner-Labourer had already received the required emoluments from the respondents No. 2 and 3.

6. Further, not only the petitioner-Labourer but even his father has signed the aforementioned settlement, which fact has gone un-rebutted. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner-Labourer was made to sign certain documents, which have been turned into settlement. Nothing evident has come on record that the settlement signed was coercive or was in a fraudulent manner. In the absence of any such material evidence produced, the bald statement of the petitioner-Labourer



that the petitioner-Labourer was made to sign blank documents, cannot be accepted.

7. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the present petition.

8. Dismissed.

9. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

March 10, 2025
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No