



RSA-3376-1999

-1-

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

(101)

RSA-3376-1999

Date of Decision: - 29.09.2025

Haryana State Electricity Board and others**....Appellants****Versus****S.L. Gulati****.....Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Chirag Girdhar, Advocate
for the appellants.

None for the respondent.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. The respondent-plaintiff had filed a suit for mandatory injunction for seeking direction to the defendants to make payment of balance amount of gratuity amounting to Rs.28345.14/- with interest. The suit was filed in the year 1993 with the pleading that the respondent-plaintiff had retired on 30.06.1992 and the trial Court had partially decreed the suit and against the said partial decree, two appeals were filed i.e. one of the present appellant and another by the respondent/plaintiff. The appeal filed by the respondent/plaintiff was allowed and the suit of the plaintiff was decreed in toto, whereas, the appeal filed by the present appellants was dismissed. Against the said



RSA-3376-1999

-2-

judgment passed by the 1st Appellate Court, only one appeal has been filed by the present appellants.

2. A perusal of the judgment of the 1st Appellate Court shows that in para 7, it has been noticed that an amount of Rs.6363.17/- has been paid to the plaintiff, thus, the dispute left was only with respect to Rs.21981.97/-. The same has also apparently been paid and further a perusal of the present appeal shows that there is no stay in favour of the present appellant.

3. None had appeared on behalf of the respondent on the last date also, therefore, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

*“Present:- Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for the appellants.*

None for the respondents.

A perusal of the paper-book would show that there is no stay in favour of the appellants and the suit of the respondent for mandatory injunction for making the payment of the gratuity was initially partly decreed but on an appeal was decreed in toto.

In the said circumstances, learned counsel for the appellants is directed to get instructions as to whether they would pursue the present appeal or not as the suit was filed in the year 1993 and the respondent would have retired by now.

Adjourned to 29.09.2025.

To be taken up in the urgent list.

September 05, 2025”

4. Learned counsel for the appellants has submitted that in view of the above-said facts and circumstances, the present appeal be

**RSA-3376-1999****-3-**

disposed of, at this stage, but liberty be granted to the appellants to revive the same in case any cause survives.

5. In view of the above, the present appeal is disposed of, however, liberty is granted to the appellants to revive the same in case any cause survives.

September 29, 2025*naresh.k***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No