

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

Civil Writ Petition No.3322 of 2014

Date of decision: 6.11.2015

The State of Punjab and others

... Petitioners

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr.H.S.Sethi, Addl., AG., Punjab,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Vikas Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.2 in CWPs No.3322, 7972, 7797 to 7828,
14032 to 14049 of 2014.

Mr.Tarun Singla, Advocate,
for respondent No.2 in CWPs No.17409 to 17420 & 17681
of 2014.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.

This order will dispose of the 65 writ petitions* as common questions of law and fact are involved in these bunch of cases. The facts are taken from CWP No.3322 of 2014 for convenience and brevity.

2. The State has approached this Court in its relentless and continuing battle against 22 employees of the Forest Department, Punjab in their 25 year old trenchant crusade against the State only to implement an

award passed by the Industrial Tribunal, Punjab, Chandigarh on December 5, 1990, which was then headed by a retired Judge of this Court. The writ petition and the SLP preferred by the State of Punjab against the award stand dismissed on November 25, 1991 and October 29, 1993 respectively. The Industrial Tribunal declined relief of regularization but granted monetary benefits to the Class-IV daily wage employees towards payment of minimum wages as prescribed for the class of employment under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948.

3. In the aftermath of the award, the applications were filed by the workmen under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 claiming money due. The efforts of the employees to secure for themselves the benefits under the award of December 5, 1990 resulted in the passing of orders by the Labour Court, Bathinda on May 25, 2011 under Section 33-C (2) of the Act computing money due on the strength of being pre-existing right under the award. The applications have been allowed.

4. The State feeling dissatisfied with the orders passed by the Labour Court, Bathinda, approached this Court in CWP No.3331 of 2012 in cause title **State of Punjab and others v. Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another.**

5. This Court had occasion to go into the correctness of the order and the grounds raised by the State of Punjab in assailing the order and after noticing the past litigation history of the case, made the following observations on May 31, 2012 : -

“This matter represents an unending saga of 102 daily wage Beldars of the Forest Department and their 22 year old crusade in pursuit of implementation of an award of the

Industrial Tribunal made final by modification by the Supreme Court and for grant of benefits given to the lowest of the regular Class IV employees. The award of the Industrial Tribunal, Punjab, Chandigarh dated 5.12.1990 declined the relief of regularization, but granted monetary benefits relevant to Class IV government employees-Beldars. The award was upheld by the Division Bench of this Court by order dated 25.11.1991. In the SLP preferred by the State of Punjab, the following order was passed on 29.10.1993:-

“Special Leave granted. Heard learned counsel. This appeal is filed by the State of Punjab questioning the award passed by the Industrial Tribunal, Punjab. The respondent, viz., Forest Department workers Union representing the cause of Beldars raised the dispute and the Tribunal passed an award directing the management to give the benefits equivalent to the Class-IV Govt. employees to the “Beldars” also. However, their claim regarding regularization of their services was rejected. It is submitted that the direction given by the Industrial Tribunal is rather vague in the sense that even among the Class-IV employees there are different grades. Having heard both counsel, we modify the award of the Tribunal to the effect that “Beldars” shall be paid the benefits that are given to the lowest of the Class-IV employees. With these directions, the appeal is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.”

Consequent upon the passing of the above order, 102 Beldars had a right to monetary benefits under the ex-parte award modified by the Supreme Court to the extent indicated in the aforesaid order. Non-implementation of the award at the hands of the Government led to filing of a contempt petition before this Court against functionaries of the Government responsible for implementing the orders. The defense of the Government was that there was no post of Beldar in the Forest Department, Punjab. It was the further stand of the State that the 102 employees were employed as Labour Coolies against work of a seasonal

nature. The order of the Supreme Court was circumvented by stating that the decision applies to “Beldars” only and there was no direction to grant benefits to any other category of employees and the petitioners not being Beldars in fact, the benefits could not be granted to them. In view of the stand of the State, this Court found the respondents not liable to be punished under the Contempt of Courts Act. The Contempt Court found that whether there is a post of Beldar in the Forest Department of Punjab or not is a controversy of subsequent period and thus it is a disputed question of fact and this cannot be raked up or resolved in contempt proceedings. This Court accepted the stand of the State that the Industrial Tribunal is not a court subordinate to the High Court, in the strict sense and therefore, the contempt petition itself was not maintainable and the only remedy left with the petitioners was to enforce the award under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short “the Act”). Reliance was placed on Mahabir Parshad vs. Naresh Kumar and others, 1993(i) Current Law Journal 859 on this point. The Court also found that 102 workmen involved in the lis had already instituted execution proceedings under Section 33-C (2) of the Act to execute the award of the Tribunal.

Mr.Amol Rattan Singh, Addl.A.G., Punjab has relied upon the order passed by this Court in Contempt Petition to contend that 102 workmen in question were not Beldars, and therefore, neither the award nor the judgment of this Court upholding the award nor the order of the Supreme Court modifying the award warrants grant of the benefit to Beldars and as such the orders would not apply. It also transpires that Sucha Singh, President of the Punjab Forest Department Workers Union, Ferozepure filed CWP No.4844 of 2003 before this Court praying for a Mandamus directing the respondents to implement the award passed by the Supreme Court in SLP No.(C) 3886 of 1992. The Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 31.3.2003 disposed of the petition by passing the following order:-

“Notice of motion returnable today. Mr.Ashok Aggarwal, Addl.A.G., Punjab who is present in Court on working accepts notice. A copy of petition

has been handed over to him. Prayer contained in this petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is to issue writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to implement judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in SLP No. (C) 3886 of 1992 Annexure P-4 dated 29.10.1993. Records of the case would bear it out that for the premise relief as has been asked for in the present petition petitioner prior in point of time issued legal notice Annexure P/8 dated January 30, 2003 and the Court is given to understand that no action thereon has been taken till date. Without going into the merits of the case at this stage this Court deems it rather more appropriate that notice Annexure P/8 dated January 30, 2003 is treated to be a representation filed on behalf of the petitioner and decided first thus we direct respondent no.2 to treat notice Annexure P-8 as representation filed by the petitioner and decided the same as expeditiously as possible and preferably within three month from the date a copy of this order is received by it in accordance with law. Disposed of accordingly. A copy of this order be supplied to learned Addl.A.G., Punjab for compliance.”

As a fall out of that decision, the representation filed by the petitioners came to be decided by order dated 22.5.2003. The representation was decided against Sucha Singh that he was not a Beldar but only a daily wage labourer. The order passed in the Contempt Petition was cited against him. It would be apposite to mention that non-implementation of the award also led to a criminal case being registered on a complaint under Section 29 of the Industrial Disputes Act, being Criminal Case No.176 of 17.10.1997 which came to be decided on 1.2.2006. The Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ferozepure by his order dated 1.2.2006 found that the accused Sh. Anoop Upadhaya could not be prosecuted as no sanction under Section 197 Cr.P.C. was obtained against him. The criminal action failed. Another important milestone pointed out by Mr.Amol Rattan Singh is the order

passed by this Court in the case of Sucha Singh (CWP No.14868 of 2003) in which an application bearing CM No.9805 of 2010 was filed where a prayer for withdrawal of the main writ petition was made and the writ petition itself was dismissed as withdrawn by order dated 21.8.2010. Learned State counsel submits that since the petition filed by Sucha Singh as President of the Workers' Union stood withdrawn, without any liberty prayed for or granted, the entire matter should be brought to a close. In order to acquaint myself with the contents of CM No.9605 of 2010 filed in CWP No.14868 of 2003, I summoned the record of that file. I find that the application under Order 23 Rule 1 for withdrawal of the writ petition was made on the ground that the workers individually had filed separate applications under Section 33-C (2) of the Act and the same were pending before the Labour Court, Bathinda. Since the workers in their individual capacity had already filed applications before the Labour Court, therefore, the petitioner Sucha Singh CWP No.3331 of 2012 (O&M) 5 prayed that he does not want to pursue that petition and sought permission to withdraw the same in the background duly explained. It may be noticed that the Workers' Union had also passed a resolution on 17.7.2010 for withdrawal of the writ petition. It was in this backdrop that the writ petition was withdrawn to ultimately fall back on the final order passed in the 33-C (2) proceedings. In the background of the above facts, this petition has been filed by the State of Punjab under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution impugning the final orders dated 25.5.2011 (P-11) passed by the Labour Court, Bathinda in proceedings under Section 33-C (2) of the Act.”

6. After hearing the learned State counsel, I passed the order of which the operative part is :-

“I have heard Mr.Amol Rattan Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners on three different dates on this matter and finally at considerable length in order to test the correctness

of the impugned order (P-11) passed by the Labour Court, after permitting the State to amend the writ petition through CM No.6947 of 2012 under Order 6 Rule 17 read with Section 151 CPC. In the application, it is stated that the original award dated 5.12.1990 did not disclose number of petitioners before the Labour Court inasmuch as the award pursuant to Ref.No.45 of 1990 under Section 10(1)(C) read with Section 2(k) of the Act is simply titled Workmen vs. Chief Conservator Forest, Punjab and Divisional Forest Officer, Punjab. The State filed writ petition. 102 private respondents were arrayed as parties on the assumption that the award was actually in favour of those persons alone. It has been pointed out that the perusal of the writ petition filed in the year 1991 shows that one Pappu Singh son of Jagir Singh was not arrayed as respondent in the earlier writ petition. It is, therefore, argued that he was not a beneficiary of the said award. Therefore, it has been questioned as to how the order has been passed in favour of the 2 nd respondent on the basis of the 1990 award. Mr. Amol Rattan Singh, however, admits that one “Pappy Singh” was arrayed as one of the 102 respondents and there could well be a spelling error. What Mr.Amol Rattan Singh suggests is that in case this Court comes to the conclusion that the order passed by the Labour Court, CWP No.3331 of 2012 (O&M) 6 Bathinda does not suffer from any infirmity, it should yet exercise caution in the handing over of monetary benefits to the real persons after identifying the claimant and verifying his antecedents before the amount is actually disbursed. I find that Pappu Singh @ Pappy Singh himself appeared in the witness-box as AW-1 and tendered into evidence his own affidavit, Ex.A-1, calculation sheet, Ex.A-2 and the orders passed by the Industrial Tribunal, this Court and the Supreme Court in support of his claim. The Labour Court examined both the issues as to the maintainability of the application and whether there is a pre-existing right to monetary benefits claimed in the application and further whether there are posts of Beldar in the cadre of the Forest Department. The letter issued and relied upon by the Learned State counsel was linked with Ex.M2 being an

order dated 16.9.2003 passed by the Chief Conservator (Plains), Punjab issuing a seniority list of Beldars. The Labour Court took judicial notice of the aforesaid order to rebut the contention that there was no post of Beldar in the Forest Department. The matter having attained finality upto the modification order passed by the Supreme Court in the SLP filed by the State, the Government cannot circumvent the order of the Supreme Court which operates in rem. The State did not resist or show to the Supreme Court that the petitioners were not Beldars at the time of disposal of the SLP. It is trite to say that Court does not pass vacuous orders nor can the State be heard to urge at this stage that the order of the Supreme Court was meaningless qua the 102 respondents before it. The Supreme Court was obviously conscious that its order would operate on 102 respondents. Otherwise, it could easily have been said or held that the respondents are not Beldars and therefore, the award is set aside. I am left with a distinct feeling that the State has been acting unfairly for 22 years only with an intention to parry off the monetary claim to benefits admissible to the 102 employees as a result of a judicial decision in their favour but at the lowest rates applicable to regular class IV employees. The Supreme Court order was passed on 29.10.1993. In fact it is a matter of shame the way the State has kept this matter hanging for over two CWP No.3331 of 2012 (O&M) 7 decades. I do not see any legal infirmity or factual error in the impugned order passed by the Labour Court, Bathinda. The orders passed in Contempt jurisdiction to my mind are not determinative of the issues, especially when the Court had noticed that execution proceedings were pending before the Labour Court which would need to be decided on merits. That order could be read only to the extent whether the contemnor had committed contempt or not and no more. In any case no new rights can be declared in contempt jurisdiction. I am unable to persuade myself with the arguments advanced by Mr.Amol Rattan Singh, learned counsel for the State or that the amounts due are substantial and therefore call for interference. This court cannot blind itself by the size of the payments due or that it will adversely affect the State

exchequer so long as they are legal and valid. I would consequently uphold the impugned order of the Labour Court. I do not find any issue in this petition which requires consideration, after admission. The writ petition stands dismissed. However, the Executing Court would ensure that the original 102 workers before the Tribunal, the recipients of the award of 1990 and in the proceedings that culminated in the Supreme Court in 1993 are cautiously and with due care identified and the amounts due to each worker after such identification are disbursed in accordance with law. With these words of caution, the matter stands disposed of.”

7. The petition was dismissed with words of caution as above. An execution application had already been filed on December 14, 2012 to implement the award before the executing court of Civil Judge, Senior Division, Ferozepur. The decision in CWP No.3331 of 2012 has admittedly become final. In the executing court, the State filed objections that the petitioners are not in a position to deposit the amount in the execution application for the reason that the workman is wrongly claiming that he is a party to the award dated December 5, 1990 and this claim was read as being contrary to the directions issued by me in CWP No.3331 of 2012 on May 31, 2012. The executing court dismissed the objections on September 21, 2013.

8. It appears that the impugned order in CWP No.3331 of 2012 was passed on May 25, 2011 by the Labour Court, Bathinda in one of the applications under Section 33-C (2) of the Act. However, another similar order was passed on October 16, 2011 by the same Tribunal allowing the application under Section 33-C(2) to another similar situated worker. That order was assailed by the State of Punjab in CWP No.26515 of 2013 which

was dismissed by a coordinate Bench on December 4, 2013. The Court held that the writ petition was misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance. The claim of the respondent-workman was found genuine and the attitude of the Government was held to be unwarranted harassment. Besides, the matter had attained finality up to the Supreme Court and the State of Punjab was not acting fairly in keeping the claim unexecuted for two and a half decades.

9. Feeling aggrieved by the order of the learned Single Judge, the State of Punjab preferred LPA No.1980 of 2014 which was dismissed on December 2, 2014. The order of the learned Single Judge was upheld. It was held that the issue whether the workman was working as *Baildar* was not relevant. The workmen were entitled to minimum wages equivalent to the minimum wages admissible to Class-IV employees particularly when they had served the appellant-State for more than 25 years. The Letters Patent Bench agreed with the learned Single Judge that the writ petition and the appeal deserved to be deprecated and the conduct of the State in filing the appeal on a plea which was never raised either before the Labour Court or before the learned Single Judge was not approved. The appeal was filed unnecessarily on false and flimsy grounds. It was dismissed with ₹ 50,000/- costs to be deposited by the appellants with the Punjab State Legal Services Authority. It was also observed that the State Government appeared to the Court on one pretext or the other to be making attempts to deny the rightful claim even to its Class-IV employees. The State Government was however relentless in its pursuit against the workmen and carried Special Leave Petition No.9557 of 2015 to the Supreme Court which was dismissed on

July 3, 2015 by observing as follows : -

“It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the respondent herein had filed the application under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on the basis of the award passed by the Labour Court even when he was not a party or beneficiary of the said award. The submission of the learned counsel appears to have some merits. However, having regard to the facts of the present case, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned order of the High Court in exercise of our powers under Article 136 of the Constitution of India. It is, however, made clear that it would be open to the petitioner to raise such an issue if any other employee approaches the Labour Court by moving an application in the same manner and whenever such a plea is raised in this behalf, the same shall be decided strictly in accordance with law.

The special leave petition is accordingly dismissed with the aforesaid observations.”

10. The dismissal was *ex parte* and in limine. The State failed to explain the case of Sukha Singh. It is not clear whether Sukha Singh is Sucha Singh, President of the Forest Department Workers Union but all the same, no finding was returned by the Supreme Court on the merits on the question and a suspicion was raised that respondent Sukha Singh was not a party or beneficiary of the award. The State of Punjab was given liberty to raise the issue in case any other employee approaches the Labour Court by moving an application which shall be decided strictly in accordance with law.

11. The State of Punjab is presently against the order dated November 29, 2011 passed by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda allowing the application under Section 33-C(2) of the Act and

computing the money due rounded to ₹ 231028.55p together with costs of ₹ 2200/- and in case of failure to deposit, the applicant would be entitled to interest @ 6% per annum from the date of institution of the application on December 8, 2003. The amounts have not been deposited and the interest element stands activated and open to payment. The Labour Court held that the right was pre-existing as the Supreme Court had observed that the Baildar shall be paid the monetary benefits that are given to the lowest of Class-IV employees. The orders of the Supreme Court are final and conclusive. The workman was compelled to file the application with a request to compute the benefit as per the calculation sheet. The Labour Court is correct that the applications under Section 33-C(2) of the Act or proceedings under Section 10 of the Act are not subject to limitation under Section 137 of the Limitation Act. Even the money due crystallized in the order was not paid by the Punjab Government in the Forest Department and the workman was compelled to take recourse to execution proceedings before the Civil Judge at Ferozepur. It is there where the objections filed by the State have been dismissed which has led to the filing of this petition assailing both the orders dated November 29, 2011 and the order rejecting the objections dated September 21, 2013.

12. I have heard Mr.H.S.Sethi, Additional AG, Punjab appearing for the petitioner-State and Mr. Vikas Singh and Mr. Tarun Singla for the respondents in this bunch of cases.

13. The second respondent in the present case is Pardhan Singh. It is claimed that Pardhan Singh was not party to the award dated December 5, 1990. It may be noted that Reference No.46 of 1990 decided by Justice

Pritpal Singh, the then Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh in

Workmen v. Chief Conservator of Forests and Divisional Forest Officer, Ferozepur was two fold; (1) whether the daily rated Beldars who have completed 240 days should be made permanent? If so, from which date and with what details and (2) Whether the Beldars are entitled to the benefits equivalent to Class IV Government employees? If so, from which date and with what details?

14. The reference was not made by name and the workers are represented by the Union the reference being under Section 2(k) and a collective dispute espoused by the union of workers. The list of names came into being as a result of litigation in CWP No.17400 of 1991 filed by the State of Punjab etc. It is from thereabout the figure of 102 started being mentioned. The aggrieved workers collectively were all represented through Sucha Singh, General Secretary, Punjab Forest Department Works Union, District Ferozepur. That petition was dismissed in limine on November 25, 1991 by the Division Bench of this Court. In Civil Appeal No.6020 of 1993 arising out of Special Leave Petition (S) No.3886 of 1992, the award was upheld but was modified by the Supreme Court on October 29, 1993 holding that the Baidars would be paid benefits that are given to the lowest of the Class-IV employees. The identity of the workmen was never disputed except by the State in CWP No.3331 of 2012 [decided by me] on the submission of the learned counsel for the State of Punjab to enter a word of “caution” so that only the rightful persons receive the money due. It was that submission which was accepted as a precautionary measure in the order dated May 31, 2012 calling upon the labour court to identify each worker cautiously before disbursing money, otherwise the petition file by the State was dismissed. The impugned award of the Labour Court was upheld. The

identity of Pradhan Singh was not disputed except for the first time before the Supreme Court in Sukha Singh's case.

15. I have read the impugned order passed by the Civil Judge, Senior Division, Ferozepur dated September 21, 2013 with the assistance of Mr. Sethi. The workman had filed his affidavit in the execution court regarding his identity. The executing court has held that the judgment debtor-State has been only trying to create confusion about the number of workers in position at the time of passing the award by the Industrial Tribunal, Punjab, Chandigarh. The executing Court has held that 102 workers in the original award in the numerical strength is the creation of the department while the case was filed by the copy of the award dated December 5, 1990 and photocopy of signatures/thumb impressions of the workers on the memo of parties.

16. In para. 7 of the impugned order, the Civil Court has recorded that original application No.46 of 1990 was filed in the name of workmen. The name of the workman was not given. Even there is no such record with the department to show that who were the workman at that material time. The Court has held that there is nothing forthcoming from the department as to how the figure of 102 workmen came about. For these reasons, the objections of the judgment debtor-State have been held not to be untenable and the same have been dismissed. The executing court has yet entered an caution that payments would be made against proper identification as per directions of the High Court for which purpose, the case was adjourned to December 7, 2013 for making payment. It is at this stage against rejection of objections that the present petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India.

17. When this Court in CWP No.3331 of 2012 entered the word “caution” and referred to 102 workers, it was only applying guarding words against wrongful disbursement of money due and payable but it did not mean that any sanctity was accorded to only 102 workers or as to how that figure came on record for the first time except as per list of names in the array of the respondents in the litigation filed by the State of Punjab before this Court. The 102 workers collectively or separately have not filed any case and in one paper-book and, therefore, I do not find any valid reason to accept the contention of Mr.Sethi that interference is warranted against the order of the executing court rejecting the objection filed by the judgment-debtor/State. On further asking and to, know the real reason why this litigation is being continued to defeat and postpone the rights of the workers which have remained pending since 1990, Mr. Sethi was fair enough to confess that the amounts involved in the litigation are enormous and the execution would result in payment of money in seven figures. The monetary angle of the fall out of the case unfortunately lingering for decades has been rejected by this Court in CWP No.3331 of 2012 when it said, “this court cannot blind itself by the size of the payments due or that it will adversely affect the State exchequer so long as they are legal and valid.” The State has not appealed against the order dated May 31, 2012 and it is final. Besides, the matter is not only covered by the decision in CWP No.3331 of 2012 but also in the litigation arising out of the order dated December 4, 2013 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP No.26515 of 2013 which has been mentioned in detail above during the discussion on the facts of the case.

18. There is, therefore, no merit found in these bunch of petitions which are rejected and ordered to stand dismissed.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

November 6, 2015
Paritosh Kumar

*

S.No.	Case No.	Party's Name
1.	CWP No.3322 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
2.	CWP No.7972 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
3.	CWP No.7797 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
4.	CWP No.7798 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
5.	CWP No.7799 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
6.	CWP No.7800 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
7.	CWP No.7801 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
8.	CWP No.7802 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
9.	CWP No.7803 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
10.	CWP No.7804 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
11.	CWP No.7805 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
12.	CWP No.7806 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
13.	CWP No.7807 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
14.	CWP No.7808 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
15.	CWP No.7809 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another

CWP No.3322 of 2014 and connected writ petitions

: 17 :

S.No.	Case No.	Party's Name
16.	CWP No.7810 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
17.	CWP No.7811 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
18.	CWP No.7812 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
19.	CWP No.7813 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
20.	CWP No.7814 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
21.	CWP No.7815 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
22.	CWP No.7816 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
23.	CWP No.7817 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
24.	CWP No.7818 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
25.	CWP No.7819 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
26.	CWP No.7820 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
27.	CWP No.7821 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
28.	CWP No.7822 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
29.	CWP No.7823 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
30.	CWP No.7824 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
31.	CWP No.7825 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
32.	CWP No.7826 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
33.	CWP No.7827 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
34.	CWP No.7828 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another

S.No.	Case No.	Party's Name
35.	CWP No.14032 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
36.	CWP No.14033 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
37.	CWP No.14034 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
38.	CWP No.14035 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
39.	CWP No.14036 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
40.	CWP No.14037 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
41	CWP No.14038 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
42.	CWP No.14039 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
43.	CWP No.14040 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
44.	CWP No.14041 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
45.	CWP No.14042 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
46.	CWP No.14043 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
47.	CWP No.14044 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
48.	CWP No.14045 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
49.	CWP No.14046 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
50.	CWP No.14047 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
51.	CWP No.14048 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
52.	CWP No.14049 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
53.	CWP No.17409 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another

S.No.	Case No.	Party's Name
54.	CWP No.17410 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
55.	CWP No.17411 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
56.	CWP No.17412 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
57.	CWP No.17413 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
58.	CWP No.17414 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
59.	CWP No.17415 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
60.	CWP No.17416 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
61.	CWP No.17417 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
62.	CWP No.17418 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
63.	CWP No.17419 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
64.	CWP No.17420 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another
65.	CWP No.17681 of 2014	The State of Punjab and others v. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bathinda and another

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

November 6, 2015
Paritosh Kumar