



CWP-1294-2020 (O&M) & -1-
CWP-846-2020 (O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

264 & 318

CWP-1294-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision :03.04.2025

The Principal Chief Conservator of Forest, Haryana
and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Rajbir and another

... Respondents

CWP-846-2020 (O&M)

The Principal Chief Conservator of Forest, Haryana
and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Sunderpal and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, DAG, Hayyana for petitioner-State.

Mr. Ajay Shekhawat, Advocate for respondent No.1
(in CWP-1294-2020)

Mr. R.S. Sangwan, Advocate for respondent No.1
(in CWP-846-2020)

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. Mr. Ajay Shekhawat, Advocate filed vakalatnama on behalf of
respondent No.1 in CWP-1294-2020. Same is taken on record.



**CWP-1294-2020 (O&M) & -2-
CWP-846-2020 (O&M)**

2. In the present petitions, the challenge is to the award dated 16.05.2019 (Annexure P/3) passed by the Presiding Officer, , Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court. Hisar by which, the services of the respondents-workmen were held to be terminated in violation to the provisions of the Industrial Tribunal Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as '1947' Act) and the benefit of reinstatement in service along with 25% back wages from the date of demand notice along with all consequential benefit has been granted to respondents-workmen. Hence. it is the prayer of the petitioner-department that the impugned order dated 16.05.2019 (Annexure P/3) be set aside.

3 On being asked to point out any perversity in the impugned award dated 16.05.2019 (Annexure P/3), learned counsel for the petitioner-State has not been able to point out any perversity especially, when a categorical finding has been given by the Labour Court that before the termination of the services of the respondents-workmen, the respondents-workmen had completed the required 240 days in service in a year preceding termination and that Section 25-F of the 1947 Act was not complied with by the petitioner-department.

4. In the absence of any rebuttal by the petitioner-department to the said finding of the Labour Court, which has been recorded on the basis of the facts and evidence which has come on record, it cannot be said that the impugned award needs any interference at the hands of this Court.

5. Further, the respondents-workmen had already been reinstated in service in pursuance to the impugned award hence, once, the respondents-workmen have already been reinstated in service and the award



**CWP-1294-2020 (O&M) & -3-
CWP-846-2020 (O&M)**

has been complied with, no ground for interference by this Court is made out and the writ petitions are accordingly dismissed.

6. Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any, is also disposed of.

7. A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of connected cases.

April 03, 2025
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No