

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh**Civil Revision No. 7230 of 2019****Date of Decision: 13.03.2024**

Satbir

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The President/Administrator, Gaur Brahman Education Society/G.B.V.P.

Sabha

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.Present: Mr. Kamaldeep Singh Redhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, Advocate
for the respondent.**Anil Kshetarpal, J.**

1. Through this revision petition, the petitioner assails the correctness of the order dated 20.04.2018. The Trial Court has rejected his application for revival of the execution petition.

2. Heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance, perused the paper-book.

3. The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that though the petitioner was reinstated in service, however, he has not been paid wages for the period from 2011 to 2016.

4. On the request of this Court, the learned counsel representing the petitioner has drawn the attention of the Court to the consent award

Rohtak, which reads as under:-

“In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (C) of sub- Section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana has referred the service matter, between the parties, mentioned above, to this Court for adjudication, vide Haryana Govt. Endst. No.35627- 32 dated 21.09.2004.

2. *The matter has been compromised between the parties. The workman Satbir vide his separately recorded statement has stated that as per compromise arrived at between him and the respondent/management he will be taken back on job by the respondent/management within one week with continuity of service but without back wages. He has also stated that he does not want to pursue the present reference.*

3. *Heard. In view of the statement of the workman the matter has been compromised between the parties. Award is passed accordingly. File be consigned to record room. Dated: 22.04.2011.”*

5. It is evident that the petitioner was held entitled to reinstatement, however, without any back wages. The Executing Court is required to execute the award. Admittedly, the petitioner has already been taken back in service w.e.f. 02.08.2016. There is no direction by the Presiding Officer for grant of any benefit if the petitioner is not immediately taken back in service.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground is made out to interfere with the impugned order. Hence, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

March 13, 2024
“DK”

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