



CWP-8202-2003

1

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

(227)

CWP-8202-2003

Date of Decision : 03.11.2025

Haryana State Minor Irrigation
and Tubewell Corporation Ltd.

...Petitioner

Versus

Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal cum
Labour Court, Panipat and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate and
Ms. Parul Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey, Advocate and
Mr. S.P. Chahar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. The petitioner/Management, fetching grievance from the order dated 16.12.2002 (Annexure P-3), wherethrough, the reference was answered in favour of the workman, and he was held entitled for re-instatement with continuity of service with 50% back wages, from the date of demand notice i.e. 13.10.1993.

2. During the course of the arguments, it reflects from the record that the services of the petitioner were terminated, way back on 31.03.1989, and now, after efflux of more than three decades, the claim of respondent No.2/workman, can only be considered with regard to the compensation.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent No.2, while placing reliance upon the judgment passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court, in RSA



versus Nirmal Singh and another' decided on 15.05.2025, submits that respondent No.2/workman, be awarded compensation in view of the ratio laid down in the said judgment.

4. Earlier, the matter was adjourned on the request of learned counsel for the petitioner, as he intends to have apt instructions from the competent authority concerned, as to whether, they are ready and willing to settle the dispute by paying lump sum compensation amount.

5. On 19.09.2025, it was apprised to this Court, that petitioner/Management, is not ready and willing to settle the dispute by paying lump sum compensation amount of Rs.1,50,000/-, to the respondent No.2/workman, and a prayer was made to address the arguments, on merits.

6. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the Managing Director, was not available, and therefore, the relevant instructions could not be obtained. However, the petitioner/Management, is now ready and willing to settle the dispute by paying lump sum compensation of Rs.1,00,000/-, to respondent No.2/workman.

7. This Court has heard the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties concerned, and is of the considered opinion that the instant dispute can be settled, by paying lump sum compensation of Rs.1,50,000/-, to the respondent No.2/workman, once and for all. Learned counsel for the respondent raises no objection to the above said proposal, made by this Court. Therefore, the dispute between the petitioner and the respondent No.2, is given quietus, with a direction upon the petitioner/Management, to pay lump sum compensation of Rs.1,50,000/-, to the respondent No.2/workman, within a period of four weeks, from the date of receipt of certified copy of

CWP-8202-2003

this order, failing which, the respondent No.2/workman, would be entitled for interest at the rate of 9% per annum.

8. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

November 03, 2025
Manpreet

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