



**CWP-1736-2001 (O&M) and
CWP-1737-2001 (O&M)**

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

(218)

Date of Decision : 27.11.2025

1. CWP-1736-2001 (O&M)

Indian Council of Agricultural Research and another ...Petitioners

Versus

Ajaib Singh and another ...Respondents

2. CWP-1737-2001 (O&M)

Indian Council of Agricultural Research and another ...Petitioners

Versus

Ram Avtar and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Naveen Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in both the cases.

Mr. Harpal Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Peeyush Gagneja, Advocate and
Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate
for respondent No.1 in both the cases.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. This Court, vide order dated 07.11.2025, had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant writ petition(s) :-

“By way of these writ petitions, orders of even date, i.e. 06.09.2000 (Annexure P-4), have been assailed by the same petitioners, vide which, the workmen were held entitled to an amount of Rs. 4825.40/-, and Rs.9522/-,



**CWP-1736-2001 (O&M) and
CWP-1737-2001 (O&M)**

respectively (in CWP-1736-2001 and CWP-1737-2001), failing which, they were further held entitled to interest @ 12% per annum, till realization of the payment.

It is a matter of record that the petitions at hand have been pending since 2001, and no stay has been granted by this Court. However, till date, no efforts were made by the petitioners to make compliance of the impugned awards, thereby, letting the awarded amount swelled on account of accruing interest.

In the given circumstances, specifically the awarded amount, by which the petitioners (petitioner No.1 is a Society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, and is under the control of the Union Government), are aggrieved, this Court is compelled to observe that they ought to have mulled over the issue(s), as sought to be raised, before instituting these petitions. Suffice it to say that much more amount might have been incurred to contest this litigation, which, of course, has no effect on any other issue.

Faced with the above, learned counsel for the petitioners prays for a short accommodation to file a specific affidavit of a senior functionary of the petitioner-Society, as to whether, the petitioners still intend to pursue these petitions.

Adjourned to 27.11.2025.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.”

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner(s), after having instructions from the quarter concerned, apprises this Court that since the amount in question, is a meagre amount, therefore, he does not wish to press the instant writ petition(s). However, he submits that liberty be reserved to the petitioner(s), to raise all legal issues in apt motion, as and when the



CWP-1736-2001 (O&M) and
CWP-1737-2001 (O&M)

occasion arises in the future, and further, this order may not be treated as a precedent.

- 3. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1, extends no objection to the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner(s).
- 4. In view of the above, the instant writ petitions(s), are **dismissed as withdrawn**, being not pressed with liberty as aforesaid.
- 5. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly.
- 6. Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected case file, as numbered above.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

November 27, 2025
Manpreet

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