

E

IN TH E SU P R E M E COUR T OF INDI A
CIVI L AP P E L L A T E JU R I S D I C T I O N
CIVI L AP P E A L NO.7 2 7 5 OF 20 0 2

SAT Y A N A R A I N

....A P P E L L A N T

Versus

M/S. HAR Y A N A B R E W E R I E S LIM I T E D

....

RES POND E N T

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

We have gone through the demand notice issued by the appellant and the statement made by him before the Labour Court, in which the appellant has not claimed that he has worked for 24 0 days continuously in one year from the date of his alleged employment till the date of his termination by the respondent.

The award of the Labour Court reveals that the appellant has not produced his engagement letter or any other documentary evidence to show that he was an employee of the respondent.

On the

contrary, the records show that the appellant was an employee of some contractor through

contd...2/-
::2::

whom he was paid daily wages on vouchers basis.

The evidence

adduced on record does not prove that the appellant was an employee of the respondent and his services were illegally terminated by the respondent. The Labour Court recorded award against the appellant which has been affirmed by the High Court.

We do not find any infirmity in the impugned order of the

