



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

CWP-1924-2001 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.04.2026

Gurpreet Kaur Kohli

....Petitioner

Versus

Presiding Officer, Labour Court Chandigarh and anotherRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, by way of instant writ petition, as cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, assails an order dated 24.01.2001 (Annexure P-1), rendered by the learned Labour Court, vide which, her application, under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, was dismissed, for lack of evidence to establish her entitlement to the grade of Rs.400-600/- from her appointment, i.e. 13.08.1981.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 05.03.2026, Court notices were ordered to be issued to the parties, since none had caused appearance on their behalf. Accordingly, Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of the respondent-Management. However, as per office report, the petitioner could not be served, since she had already superannuated.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-Management informs this Court that unfortunately, petitioner has since expired.



4. However, till date, no application has been moved, at the instance of her legal representative(s), for impleadment, to get the instant *lis* adjudicated. In such circumstances, no purpose would be served by keeping this petition pending, which was filed way back in the year 2001.
5. In view the above, the instant writ petition is **dismissed for want of prosecution**. However, liberty is reserved to the legal representative(s) of the petitioner, if any, to get this petition revived by moving an apt motion/application, if the occasion so arises.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

08.04.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No