



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

FAO-4984-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : 10.01.2025

Khurshid and others

..... Appellants

versus

Modh. Imran and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Shivam Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the appellants.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Present appeal has been preferred by the claimants. The only issue with respect to penalty. The operative part of the order reads as under:-

“It was also argued by the A.R. of the applicants that the respondent did not help the poor dependents of his deceased employee by depositing the compensation within one month and therefore, he may be penalized and under the provisions of the Act, as the Commissioner is also empowered to impose penalty up to 50% of the awarded amount. He also relied upon the authority reported as **RAMALU BALKRISHNA SAGAR VS RAMBHAU TUKARAM SHENDRE 2006(3) T.A.C.928**. In view of the above circumstances, I hold that according to the provisions of the Act, a show cause notice be issued to the respondents to the effect why he should not be penalized for his act in not helping the poor dependent of his deceased employees by depositing the compensation amount within one month.”



- 2. From the aforesaid order, it is clear that qua penalty, already show cause notice has been issued to the respondent-employer.
- 3. In view thereof, nothing survives in the present appeal and the same is ordered to be dismissed.
- 4. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

10.01.2025
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No