



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

**CWP-7782-2025**

**Date of Decision : 20-03-2025**

**AKHLESH YADAV ALIAS AKHILESH KUMAR YADAV**  
.....Petitioner

**VERSUS**

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

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present:     Mr. Anshul Sharma, Advocate  
                  for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)**

1.            In the present petition, the challenge is to the award dated 11.11.2024, copy of which has been appended as Annexure P-10, passed by the Labour Court by which, the claim raised by the petitioner under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has been declined on the ground that the petitioner has not been able to prove that there is a master and servant relationship between the petitioner and respondents-establishment.

2.            Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that once the petitioner has given the statement, the same should have been given due weightage to hold that the petitioner was working with the respondent-establishment starting from the year 09.03.1999 till 20.08.2016.

3.            I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the records of the present case with his able assistance.

4. It may be noticed that the award impugned in the present petition, discusses all the facts and evidence which has been brought on record. Apart from the bald statement of the petitioner, no other document has been brought on record to prove there existed master and servant relationship between the petitioner and the respondent-establishment. No appointment order or attendance card has been brought on record to prove the master and servant relationship between the petitioner and the respondent-establishment.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner concedes the fact that, no such documents were brought on record.

6. Once, it is a conceded position that nothing was brought on record to prove the master and servant relationship, the Tribunal was within its jurisdiction to reject the claim raised by the petitioner.

7. It may be noticed that the award dated 11.11.2024 (Annexure P-10) can only be set aside in case there is any perversity in the award qua the evidence and the facts brought on record.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show any perversity in the award dated 11.11.2024 (Annexure P-10) qua the evidence and facts brought on record hence, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

9. Present petition is dismissed.

20-03-2025  
Sapna Goyal

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)**  
**JUDGE**

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES  
Whether reportable: NO