



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

106

CWP-880-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 18.01.2025

UPINDER KUMAR SINGLA

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND LABOUR
COURT, U T CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present :- Mr. U. K. Agnihotri, Advocate with
Mr. A. K. Agnihotri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the grievance of the petitioner is that by the impugned order dated 12.11.2024 (Annexure P-9), the assistance of a legal practitioner has been allowed in the favour of respondents No. 2 to 4, which is arbitrary and illegal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the legal assistance cannot be provided and therefore, the order dated 12.11.2024 (Annexure P-9) passed by the Tribunal, impugned in the present petition is liable to be set aside.

3. On being asked, whether the petitioner has also been given the said benefit and that too at the cost of respondents No.2 to 4, learned counsel for the petitioner conceded that in the impugned order, not only the respondents No.2 to 4, but even the petitioner has been given the assistance of the legal practitioner of his own choice and that too at the cost of respondents No. 2 to 4.



CWP-880-2025

:2:

4. Consequently, the said fact came on record, that both the parties have been given the assistance of the legal practitioner, and the petitioner has been given the said benefit at the cost of respondents No.2 to 4, no grievance of the petitioner can be entertained. Further, it may be noticed that a grievance was raised by the petitioner-workman before the Tribunal that he is not capable of engaging a lawyer and that is why, accepting the said plea he was given the assistance of legal practitioner of his own choice whereas, in the present petition, the petitioner has engaged a counsel.

5. It has been observed that the petitioner has all the means to engage a lawyer of his own choice before this Court, he can always avail the services of a legal practitioner of his own choice with regard to the order passed and that too at the cost of respondents No.2 to 4.

6. Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out for any inference by this Court and present petition is accordingly dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

18.01.2025

Rimpal

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No