



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

227 (16 cases)

Decided on 08.07.2026

1. RA-LP-69-2025 IN LPA-25-2025(O&M)

Gurdeep Singh Saini ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M/s Maruti Suzuki India Limited & Anr
...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

2. RA-LP-68-2025 IN LPA-27-2025 (O&M)

Duli Chand Pathak ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M/s Maruti Suzuki India Limited & Anr
...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

3. RA-LP-50-2025 IN LPA-739-2025 (O&M)

Anil Kumar Sharma ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another
...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

4. RA-LP-72-2025 IN LPA-28-2025 (O&M)

Manoj Kumar ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M/s Maruti Suzuki India Limited
...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

5. RA-LP-73-2025 IN LPA-30-2025 (O&M)

Ishwar Dayal ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M/s Maruti Suzuki India Limited
...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

6. RA-LP-71-2025 IN LPA-32-2025 (O&M)

Jitender Kumar Sharma ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M/s Maruti Suzuki India Limited & Anr
...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

7. RA-LP-70-2025 IN LPA-44-2025 (O&M)

Devender Kumar ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M/s Maruti Suzuki India Limited & Anr

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

8. RA-LP-67-2025 IN LPA-45-2025 (O&M)

Rajvir Giri ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M/s Maruti Suzuki India Limited & Anr

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

9. RA-LP-47-2025 IN LPA-741-2025 (O&M)

D.K. Chauhan @ Dinesh Kumar Chauhan through LRs

...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

10. RA-LP-61-2025 IN LPA-743-2025 (O&M)

Shri Babu Sebastian ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

11. RA-LP-46-2025 IN LPA-745-2025 (O&M)

S.K. Sharma ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

12. RA-LP-56-2025 IN LPA-746-2025 (O&M)

G.K. Walia @ Gobind Kumar Walia ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

13. RA-LP-55-2025 IN LPA-747-2025 (O&M)

K. Padmanabhan ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

14. RA-LP-51-2025 IN LPA-748-2025 (O&M)

Surender Mohan Through LRs ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

15. RA-LP-48-2025 IN LPA-749-2025 (O&M)

Ranjan Kumar Dalai ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

16. RA-LP-60-2025 IN LPA-750-2025 (O&M)

Amar Chakravarty ...Non-Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

The Presiding Officer & Another

...Review applicant(s)/Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present :- Mr. Pawan Mutneja, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate
for the review applicant(s)/respondent(s) in RA-LP-69-2025,
RA-LP-68-2025, RA-LP-72-2025, RA-LP-73-2025,
RA-LP-71-2025, RA-LP-70-2025 & RA-LP-67-2025.

Mr. D.S. Patwalia, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Adityajit Singh Chadha, Advocate
for the review-applicant(s)/respondent(s) in RA-LP-46-2025,
RA-LP-47-2025, RA-LP-51-2025, RA-LP-50-2025,
RA-LP-48-2025, RA-LP-61-2025, RA-LP-55-2025,
RA-LP-56-2025 & RA-LP-60-2025.

Mr. Sumeet Jain, Advocate for non-applicant/appellant
in RA-LP-72-2025.

Mr. Surya Kant, Advocate (through V.C.) and
Mr. Paul S. Saini, Advocate for other non-applicants/appellants.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

By this common order, all the above 16 review applications filed in respective appeals, are being decided as they arise against the same impugned order.

2. These review applications have been preferred against the order dated 12.03.2025 passed in the aforesaid LPAs bearing LPA-25-2025, LPA-27-2025, LPA-739-2025, LPA-28-2025, LPA-30-2025, LPA-32-2025, LPA-44-2025, LPA-45-2025, LPA-741-2025, LPA-743-2025, LPA-745-2025, LPA-746-2025, LPA-747-2025, LPA-748-2025, LPA-749-2025 & LPA-750-2025. The relevant and operative part of the order reads thus:

“9. Though we find that the observation of the learned Single Judge as regards the efflux of time and the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on the issue, does not require any interference, yet we find force in the submission of the learned Senior counsel that had the impugned award of the Labour Court been upheld, the appellants would have received more compensation than the one enhanced by the learned Single Judge.

10. Considering the said limited prayer of the learned Senior counsel for the appellants, we find that there is no necessity to issue notice to the respondent-Management. It may also be noticed that the appellant(s)-workmen had been fighting the legal battle for the last more than 14 years and in case the present proceedings are further lingered on, they will suffer the protracted litigation for another long period.

11. Thus, keeping in view the aforesaid limited submission of the learned Senior counsel, we dispose of the present batch of

the appeals with the direction that the enhanced compensation awarded by the learned Single Judge, will carry interest @ 6% per annum.

12. With the observations, all the appeals are disposed of.”

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the review applicant(s)/respondent(s) contend that the dispute before the Court arose on account of an illegal strike by the workmen of the review-applicant/Management in the year 2000, whereby the production was stalled and the workmen held demonstrations both inside and outside the factory. The said demonstrations were held notwithstanding an order having been passed by the Civil Court, restraining the workmen from holding demonstrations within a radius of 100 meters of the factory premises. Disregarding the order of the Civil Court, the workmen pitched a tent in front of the main gate impeding the ingress and egress of both workmen as well as the men and material. The tent was even though removed by the police, yet, it was pitched again by the side of the gate, as an act of defiance. The workmen resorted to threatening and intimidating the other employees. Eventually 24 persons were identified as the workmen inciting/instigating and sabotaging the production. Having lost confidence in continuation of the aforesaid workmen, the review-applicant(s)/Management initiated proceedings against the said workmen. Their services were eventually terminated on proven charges of misconduct.

4. The aforesaid order of termination was eventually challenged by the aggrieved workmen before the Labour Court. The defence taken by the review applicant(s)/Management was not wrongly accepted by the

Labour Court and the Labour Court passed an award directing compensation to be paid to the non-applicants/appellants herein. Dissatisfied with the same, the review applicant(s)/Management as well as the non-applicant(s)/workmen preferred their respective writ petitions. The said writ petitions were decided vide a common judgment dated 09.12.2024 passed in CWP-6762-2014.

5. The learned Single Judge vide the aforesaid judgment partly modified the award and directed that an additional compensation to the tune of 20% over and above the awarded compensation be granted to the workmen.

6. Still dissatisfied with the same, the review applicant(s)/Management preferred LPAs bearing No. LPA No.2049 of 2025, LPA No.2055 of 2025, LPA No.2056 of 2025, LPA No.2057 of 2025, LPA No.2058 of 2025, LPA No.2059 of 2025, LPA No.2060 of 2025, LPA No.2065 of 2025, LPA No.2066 of 2025, LPA No.2070 of 2025, LPA No.2074 of 2025, LPA No.2075 of 2025, LPA No.2067 of 2025, while the workmen also preferred their separate appeals bearing Nos. LPA-25-2025, LPA-27-2025, LPA-739-2025, LPA-28-2025, LPA-30-2025, LPA-32-2025, LPA-44-2025, LPA-45-2025, LPA-741-2025, LPA-743-2025, LPA-745-2025, LPA-746-2025, LPA-747-2025, LPA-748-2025, LPA-749-2025 & LPA-750-2025.

7. Learned Senior Counsel for the review-applicant(s)/Management contend that while the Letters Patent Appeals preferred by the review applicant(s)/Management are still pending, the Division Bench of this Court decided the Letters Patent Appeals preferred by

the non-applicants/workmen vide an ex-parte common order dated 12.03.2025 and directed a further modification of the judgment dated 09.12.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge and ordered that the enhanced compensation shall also carry interest at the rate of 6% per annum.

8. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the review applicant(s)/Management contend that the aforesaid order is liable to be reviewed for the following reasons:-

- i Despite there being a material alteration in the judgment of the Single Bench dated 09.12.2024 and the order being to the prejudice of the review applicant(s)/Management, no opportunity of hearing was granted. The said order is hence in violation of principles of natural justice. The legal position being well settled to the effect that if outcome of an order is likely to be to the prejudice of the other party, an opportunity of hearing ought to be granted to such party and no order should be passed against them without hearing.
- ii They further contend that the Letters Patent Appeals preferred by the review applicant(s)/Management are still pending before this Court. However, due to the above order, the Letters Patent Appeals preferred by the Management have been practically rendered infructuous.

9. In support of their case, learned Senior Counsel place reliance on the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in the matter of ***“State of Jammu & Kashmir Vs. Sham Lal and others”*** reported as **1996 AIR (SC) 2208**, relevant extract thereof reads thus:

“6. Apart from the question that it is rather doubtful whether a Letters Patent Appeal would lie against an order vacating an ex parte interim order of stay, we find that the impugned order of the Division Bench is otherwise also unsustainable. We say it with respect to the learned Division Bench that it was not a proper manner of disposing of the Letters Patent Appeal. The Letters Patent Appeal has been "allowed" at the preliminary stage, without issuance of any notice to the appellant and without even admitting it. It could not be done. According to the Division Bench, the issuance of notice was not considered necessary "in view of the innocuousness of the order proposed to be passed". We cannot agree with the view of the High Court. The order of the Division Bench is not an 'innocuous' order. The Division Bench has in actual effect set aside the order of the single Judge dated 12-7-95 and remanded the case for the reconsideration, without expressly saying so. The Division Bench also restored the order dated 27-5-95 by staying the investigation in FIR 3/95. Such an order could not be made by the Division Bench with (without) hearing the parties. On the plainest consideration of justice, in our opinion the Bench was obliged to hear the opposite party i.e. the appellant herein before passing the impugned order more so since the impugned order before the Division Bench had been made after hearing the appellant, herein. We do not wish to express any opinion on the merits of the controversy in the writ petition but find that the

order staying the investigation by the Division Bench in the manner in which it has been done is not at all sustainable. The grievance of the appellant that it has been seriously prejudiced by the impugned order is well founded.”

10. Referring to the above, it is vehemently argued that the Management has been burdened with an enhanced financial burden as a direct consequence of the impugned order. There is no legally sustainable justification provided for dispensing with the necessity of effecting service on the affected party.

11. Learned counsel appearing on behalf the non-applicant/appellant in RA-LP-72-2025 in LPA-28-2025, however contends that the workmen therein have further approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court against the order of the Division Bench being dis-satisfied of the same and the SLPs are still pending. They however do not dispute that there is no stay on the proceedings pending before this Court. They also do not dispute that the review applicant(s)/Management had not been granted opportunity of hearing in the above Letters Patent Appeals and also that the Letters Patent Appeals preferred by the review applicant(s)/Management are still pending before this Court and have not been finally decided. It is also not in dispute that the order in question alters the position to the prejudice of the review-applicant(s)/Management and that on the first principles of natural justice, the order may not be sustainable. They however contend that there are cogent reasons that weighed with the Division Bench while passing the aforesaid order finding a *prima facie* strong case in favour of the non-applicant(s)/workmen.

12. No judgment is however cited by counsel for the non-applicant(s)/appellants-workmen.

13. We have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the brief undisputed facts noticed above as well as the judgment relied upon by the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the review applicant(s)/Management.

14. It thus remains undisputed that the Letters Patent Appeals preferred by the Management are pending while the Letters Patent Appeals preferred by the workmen were disposed of by modifying the judgment of Single Judge. An additional fiscal liability in the form of compensatory interest @6% per annum, was awarded, on enhanced compensation. No hearing was undisputedly granted to the Management. As a necessary consequence, the judgment of Single Bench has already been upheld by Division Bench without even examining merits of the challenge raised by the Management. The appeals of the Management, in effect, have already been rendered futile. The statutory remedy provided to the Management, against the judgment of Single Judge, has in essence been denied.

15. Even though counsel for the workmen defended the order but their own actions belie their commitment in their arguments. Despite arguing that the order of Division Bench is good, yet, dis-satisfied of the same, they have already preferred SLP against the same. Counsel for the workmen failed to point out any prejudice if the Letters Patent Appeals are ordered to be re-heard on merits after granting hearing to all parties.

16. In view of the undisputed facts and considering that in the Letters Patent Appeals preferred by the non-applicant(s)/workmen, the

impugned order was passed, modifying the award to the prejudice of the review applicant(s)/Management and that too without granting any opportunity and assigning any specific reason dispensing the necessity of effecting service on the review applicant(s)/Management, we are of the view that the impugned order deserves to be reviewed. The impugned order has been passed to the prejudice of the review applicant(s)/Management ignoring the cardinal judicial precedence that no order shall be passed against a party without affording an opportunity of hearing.

17. We are of the opinion that the settled legal principles have seemingly not been adhered to in the present case(s). Consequently, the present review applications are **allowed**. The order dated 12.03.2025 passed in LPA-25-2025, LPA-27-2025, LPA-739-2025, LPA-28-2025, LPA-30-2025, LPA-32-2025, LPA-44-2025, LPA-45-2025, LPA-741-2025, LPA-743-2025, LPA-745-2025, LPA-746-2025, LPA-747-2025, LPA-748-2025, LPA-749-2025 & LPA-750-2025 is recalled and the main Appeals are directed to be heard on merits.

18. The aforesaid Letters Patent Appeals are accordingly restored to their original number.

19. Registry is directed to list the aforesaid appeals as per roster.

20. A copy of this order be placed on the files of the connected cases.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

08.07.2026

Sumit Gusain

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No