



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH.**

116

LPA-2127-2025 (O&M).**Date of Decision: 29.09.2025.**

Ram Parkash

....Appellant.

VERSUS

Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal cum  
Labour Court, Chandigarh and others

....Respondents.

\*\*\*

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

---

**Present:** Mr. Raj Kaushik, Advocate for the appellant.

\*\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)**CM-5347 and 5348-LPA-2025

Prayer in these applications is for condonation of delay of 40 days in filing and 245 days in re-filing the appeal respectively.

Heard.

For the reasons stated in the applications, the same are allowed and delay of 40 days in filing and 245 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

**LPA-2127-2025**

The appellant has challenged the judgment of the Single Bench dated 19.07.2024, whereby the writ petition preferred by the appellant impugning the Award dated 31.05.2023 passed by the Labour Court has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that there was a delay in raising the industrial dispute before the Labour Court due to family circumstances including the illness of his wife.

3. Heard.

4. The appellant, who was working as a ‘Conductor’, is stated to have been dismissed from service on 12.07.2005 for remaining willfully absent from duty w.e.f. 31.12.2003. The appellant was on duty on the Chandigarh—Haridwar—Rishikesh route, but he remained absent from 31.12.2003. He had served the demand notice on 16.08.2021 and filed the claim statement on 23.12.2021 i.e. after a delay of 17 years. The Labour Court had dismissed the claim of the appellant as he could not explain the huge delay in raising the claim.

5. We are in agreement with the judgment of the Single Bench that the appellant could not explain the huge delay of 17 years in raising the claim. In the event of difficulty due to family circumstances, the appellant ought to have led evidence in that regard, but in any event the huge delay of 17 years cannot be condoned in the afore-noted facts and circumstances. The appellant remained absent from duty without leave for a period of six months. It is manifest that the appellant had abandoned service and only after 17 years has turned around and raised the claim. It is also probable that the appellant would have been employed elsewhere and had, therefore, abandoned service.

6. We, therefore, do not find any illegality in the judgment of the Single Bench dismissing the writ petition of the appellant. Consequently, the Letters Patent Appeal, being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)**  
**JUDGE**

**29.09.2025**

*jitender* Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/ No