

118-3

2025.PHHC.094668-DB



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CM-2460-LPA-2025 in/and
LPA-996-2025 (O&M)**

Date of decision : 29.07.2025

Anil Kumar

...Appellant

Vs.

M/s K.B.Gas Service and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Ms. Ruchita Garg, Advocate
for the applicant-appellant (through video conferencing).

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.(Oral)

CM-2460-LPA-2025

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 29 days in preferring the appeal.

Heard.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 29 days in preferring the appeal is condoned.

Main case

The appellant has challenged the order passed by the Single Bench on 11.12.2024 in CWP No.16946-2021 and other connected cases, whereby the compensation awarded by the Labour Court has been enhanced to Rs.4,500/- for each year of service rendered by the appellant.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant had

put in over 08 years of service and therefore, the amount of compensation be enhanced.

3. Heard.

4. The appellant is stated to have worked as a Delivery Boy with respondent No.1, who is stated to be a LPG distributor. The appellant along with co-workers were retrenched on 11.06.2016. They approached the Labour Court and vide the award dated 02.12.2019, compensation to the tune of Rs.20,000/- plus litigation expenses of Rs.10,000/- was awarded to them. The appellant has challenged the award of the Labour Court by preferring writ petition bearing CWP No.4140-2020 and the Single Bench of this Court vide order dated 11.12.2024 has enhanced the compensation to the tune of Rs.4,500/- for each year of service rendered in addition to the litigation expenses awarded by the Labour Court.

5. We are of the considered view that the amount of compensation enhanced by the Single Bench appears to be just and adequate and there is no manifest illegality in the order of the Single Bench warranting interference in letters patent appeal.

6. Consequently, the appeal stands dismissed.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE**

29.07.2025

vanita	Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
	Whether Reportable :	Yes	No