



CWP-4231 of 2018 :1:

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

271 (3 cases)

**CWP-4231 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 03.03.2025**

PARAMJIT KAUR

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

**PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, AMRITSAR
AND OTHERS**

..... Respondents

2.

CWP-4285 of 2018 (O&M)

SAWINDER KAUR

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

**PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, AMRITSAR
AND OTHERS**

..... Respondents

3.

CWP-4321 of 2018 (O&M)

GURPREET KAUR

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

**PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, AMRITSAR
AND OTHERS**

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present :- Mr. Gaurav Kalsi, Advocate for
Mr. H. S. Batth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

None for respondent No.3.



CWP-4231 of 2018 :2:

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present bunch of petitions, the challenge is to the order dated 03.10.2017 (Annexure P-9) passed by the Industrial Tribunal, Amritsar by which, the claim of the petitioners that their services have been terminated by violating the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as '1947 Act') has not been accepted by the Tribunal and a finding has been recorded that the petitioners left the establishment on their own after final settlement of their dues.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that there was no valid reason for the petitioners to leave the job rather, the petitioners were forced to leave the job and the same will amount to termination hence, the Tribunal failed to appreciate all the facts in the correct perspective so as to grant the relief which was admissible to the petitioners under 1947 Act.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the record with his able assistance.

4. A finding has been recorded by the Labour Court on the basis of the document Ex.MW1/1 wherein, the petitioners have signed the full and final settlement of their dues before leaving the job. Once, the said document has not been rebutted by the petitioners and all benefits admissible to the workmen including the provident fund was released to the petitioners, the argument of the petitioners that leaving of the job was not voluntary but forceful so as to treat the same as termination has rightly not been accepted by the Labour Court.

5. Further, on being asked to point out the perversity of the



CWP-4231 of 2018 :3:

findings given by the Labour Court keeping in view the fact and the evidence which have been brought on record, learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to point out any perversity in the impugned award.

6. Keeping in view of above, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court and present petitions are dismissed.

7. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the connected case files.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

03.03.2025

Rimpal

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No