

(2016) 06 SHI CK 0024
In the High Court Of Himachal Pradesh
Case No : LPA No. 87 of 2016

H.P. State Electricity Board Ltd.

APPELLANT

Vs

Ram Dass

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 01-06-2016

Acts Referred:

Limitation Act, 1963 — Section 5

Citation : (2016) ILRHP 1578

Hon'ble Judges : Mr. Mansoor Ahmad Mir, C.J. and Mr. Sandeep Sharma, J.

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Mr. Sanjeev Bhushan, Senior Advocate with Ms. Abhilasha Kaundal, Advocate, Mr. Satyen Vaidya, Senior Advocate with Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocate, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Mr. Mansoor Ahmad Mir, C.J.(Oral)—CMP(M) No. 115/2016 & LPA No. 87/2016.

This application has been filed for condonation of 298 days" delay which has crept-in in filing the present appeal, on the grounds taken in the memo of application. Along with the limitation application, LPA has been filed which is registered as LPA No. 87 of 2016.

2. It is apt to record herein that the applicants/appellants have not mentioned what steps they have taken right from the passing of the impugned judgment till the filing of the limitation application. The limitation application is bereft of reasons and the applicants have not shown cause for one day, not to speak of 298 days, i.e, almost a year. Only on this count, the limitation petition merits to be dismissed. However, we have gone through the impugned judgment. The impugned judgment is well reasoned, needs no interference, as the rights and interests of a workman are involved.

3. Law leans in favour of the labourers, unless it is shown that the Writ Court has

fallen in an error.

4. Having said so, there is no merit in the appeal also. Accordingly, the limitation petition is dismissed. Consequently, the LPA is dismissed as time barred along with pending applications.