
**The Assistant Executive Engineer, Cauverv Neeravari Nigam Limited,
Nanjangud, Mysore District and another - Petitioners @HASH The Deputy
Labour Commissioner And Appellate Authority, Bangalore and Others**

Writ Petition No. 37385 of 2016 (L-PG).

Court: KARNATAKA HIGH COURT

Date of Decision: July 20, 2016

Acts Referred:

Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 - Section 7

Citation: (2016) 6 KantLJ 501

Hon'ble Judges: Aravind Kumar, J.

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Sri. K.S. Bhumaiah, Advocate, for the Petitioner; Sri. D. Ashwathappa, Additional Government Advocate, for the Respondents

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

Aravind Kumar, J. - Heard Sri K.S. Bhumaiah, learned Counsel appearing for petitioners. Perused the records.

2. The only issue which arisen for consideration in this writ petition is:

Whether Appellate Authority was justified in refusing to entertain the appeal on the ground of delay and it was barred by limitation?

3. Respondent-workman filed an application for grant of payment of gratuity. Controlling Authority by order dated 25-11-2014 - Annexure-A

allowed the application and directed writ petitioners herein to pay a sum of Rs. 1,90,978-00 with interest at 10% quantified at Rs. 31,341-00 and

in all petitioners herein were directed to pay a sum of Rs. 2,22,319-00 to respondent-workman.

4. Being aggrieved by this order, an appeal came to be filed by the writ petitioners before Appellate Authority. By impugned endorsement dated

16-10-2015 - Annexure-B, Appellate Authority rejected the appeal on the ground that it has been filed bey and the prescribed period of 120 days

and Section 7 of Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act for short) does not empower the Appellate Authority to

extend the limitation or condone the delay" in filing the appeal.

5. Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of Bangalore Metropolitan Transport Corporation v. The Deputy Labour Commissioner,

and The Appellate Authority under the Payment of Gratuity Act Bangalore and Others, ILR 2009 Kar. 717 while examining similar

question has held that payment of gratuity rules, do not vests any power to the Appellate Authority to extend the time beyond the period

prescribed by the proviso to sub-section (7) of Section 7 of the and Legislature had will fully omitted to incorporate the applicability off on 5 of the

Limitation Act, 1963.

6. Sri K.S. Bheemaiah, learned Counsel appearing for petitioner would draw attention of this Court to the fact that amount as determined by be

Controlling Authority, has already been deposited before the Controlling Authority itself, which shows the bona fides of writ petitioners-employer

and petitioners having very good case on merits and as such, Appellate Authority could not have dismissed the appeal.

7. A bare reading of proviso to Section 7(7) of the Act would indicate that appeal has to be filed within 60 days from date of order or receipt of

communication of order of Controlling Authority" and for sufficient cause being shown, further 60 days delay can be condoned. Thus, Appellate

Authority has no power to condone the delay beyond 120 delays. Mere depositing the amount would not enlarge the scope of proviso to sub-

section (7) of Section 7 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972. As such, contention of Sri K.S. Bheemaiah, learned Counsel for petitioners

deserves to be rejected and accordingly it stands rejected. Hence, I do not find any good ground to entertain these writ petitions and it deserves to

be dismissed for reasons assigned by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in BMTC"s case referred to supra. Accordingly, the writ petitions

stands rejected.