



CWP-14614-2022 and CWP-14638-2022 :1:

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

**291
VED PAL**

CWP-14614-2022 (O&M)

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

**PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT AND ANR**

..... Respondents

292

**CWP-14638-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision : 07.01.2025**

KRISHAN PAL

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

**PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, PANIPAT AND ANR**

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present :- Mr. Rajiv Rathore, Advocate for
Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate
for the petitioner in both cases.

Mr. Gaurav Jindal, Additional AG, Haryana.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. By this common order, two petitions are being decided. The challenge is to the award dated 11.11.2021 (Annexure P-1) by which, the claim raised by the petitioner(s) before the Labour Court, Panipat has been rejected.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) submits that without considering the facts on record, the claim of the

**CWP-14614-2022 and CWP-14638-2022****:2:**

petitioner(s) has been declined by the Tribunal which is arbitrary and illegal and the consequent relieving of the petitioner(s) by the respondent No.2 is also arbitrary and illegal.

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

4. Firstly, respondent No.2 has not been served by the petitioner despite various opportunities. As per the report, the respondent No.2-company is no longer in existence. Even otherwise, on merits, the petitioner(s) were on strike and did not perform the duties and despite much persuasion at the hands of respondent No.2-company the petitioners did not join back the duties and appropriate orders were passed that the petitioners have abandoned their job.

5. The Tribunal after considering the facts and evidence which came on record has recorded a categorical finding that the workmen never performed the duties and were on strike and despite being given notice to join back they never joined hence, their claim has been rejected.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) has not been able to show as to how the said finding is perverse keeping in view the evidence which had come on record coupled with the fact that the respondent No.2-company has already been closed and nothing has been shown to this Court qua the perversity in the findings recorded by the Tribunal.

7. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court and the present petitions are accordingly dismissed.



CWP-14614-2022 and CWP-14638-2022 :3:

8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the connected case file numbered above.

07.01.2025	(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
Rimpal	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No