



**IOIN-CWP-18760-2006 in/& -1-
CWP-18760-2006 (O&M)**

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

227

**IOIN-CWP-18760-2006 in/&
CWP-18760-2006 (O&M)
Date of Decision :03.07.2025**

Dalbir Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

**Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ludhiana
and others**

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Om Pal Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

None for the respondents.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

IOIN-CWP-18760-2006

Present IOIN has been placed before this Court since service upon respondent No.2 is incomplete.

By consent of learned counsel for the petitioners, main writ petition is taken up for hearing today itself.

IOIN stands disposed of.

CWP-18760-2006

1. Present petition was filed challenging the award dated 19.04.2006 (Annexure P/1) passed by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ludhiana by which, the application filed by the petitioners-workmen claiming the wages has been allowed for the period starting from January



**IOIN-CWP-18760-2006 in/& -2-
CWP-18760-2006 (O&M)**

2000 to June 2000 on the ground that in actuality the petitioners-workmen had worked from January 2000 till November 2000 but the salary for the said period has not been directed to be paid by the Labour Court.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners-workmen.
3. On being asked to point out as to on what account, the salary up to November, 2000 is being asked and what are the relevant documents brought on record to show that the petitioners-workmen were discharging the duties not upto June, 2000 but upto November, 2000, learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show any such document to underpin the claim put forth. Rather a finding has been recorded by the Labour Court that the respondent-company had already closed down in June, 2000 after which, there was no work being performed by the petitioners-workmen, which fact has also gone unrebutted.
5. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the present case, learned counsel for the petitioners-workmen has failed to prove that the impugned award is perverse to the evidence or facts brought on record so as to claim salary upto November, 2000 hence, no ground for interference by this Court is made out and the writ petition is accordingly dismissed.
- 6 Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any, is also disposed of.

July 03, 2025
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No