



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-6357-2001

Date of decision: 08.08.2025

M/s United Engineering through its PartnerPetitioner

Versus

Presiding Officer Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Rohtak and
anotherRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar Mutneja, Senior Advocate, with
Ms. Suverna Mutneja, Advocate,
Mr. Vishesh Bhatia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tajeshwar Singh Sullar, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel),
for respondent No.2

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. This Court, vide order dated 06.08.2025, had passed the
following order:-

*“1.The instant writ petition is directed against the
impugned award dated 20.02.2001 (Annexure P-18), as passed
by the learned Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, Rohtak.*

*2. At the time of issuance of notice of motion, the Division
Bench of this Court, vide order dated 25.05.2001, had stayed the
operation of the award, subject to comply the provisions of
Section 17-B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.*

*3. The instant petition is pending since the year 2001. It is
informed to this Court, that respondent No.2/workman, by now
has attained the age of 71 years. The petitioner is directed to file
a specific affidavit before the next date of hearing, along with
relevant documents, to substantiate that compliance of Section
17-B of the ibid Act, has been made.*

4. List this matter on 08.08.2025, for arguments.



5. To be shown in the urgent list. 6. It is made clear that no further request for adjournment on behalf of either of the parties concerned, shall be entertained.”

2. Today, learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that his office is not able to contact any of the representatives of the petitioner-company, as the said company has already been shut down. In such circumstances, he is not in a position to respond to the order (supra).

3. In view of the above, it seems that nobody is interested in pursuing the instant petition. Therefore, this Court is left with no other option, but to dismiss this petition for want of prosecution.

4. Ordered accordingly.

5. However, in case, any cause of action still survives, the petitioner is at liberty to revive the instant petition by moving an apt application/motion.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

08.08.2025

Ak Sharma

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