

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

213 -2

Decided on : 04.08.2025

CWP-12228-2003 (O&M)

BOHAR SINGH

..PETITIONER

Versus

PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, BATHINDA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CWP-534-2001 (O&M)

THE FEROZEPUR CENTRAL COOPERATIVE BANK LIMITED

..PETITIONER

Versus

BOHAR SINGH AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

PRESENT: Ms. Shivani Sharma, Advocate for the Bank.

Mr. S. K. Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP No. 12228-2003
for respondent No. 1 in CWP-534-2001.


HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

In both the present petitions, the challenge is to same impugned award dated 14.09.2000 (Anneuxre P-12), hence, they are being dealt together.

CWP-12228-2003 (O&M)

1. In the present petition, impugned award dated 14.09.2000 (Anneuxre P-12) has been challenged by the workman on the ground that the benefit of back-wages has not been granted.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-workman submits that he is not in contact with the petitioner-workman since long and he also does not know as to whether the petitioner-



CWP-12228-2003 (O&M)

-2-

workman is alive and wishes to continue with the present pleadings or not, hence, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner-workman to revive the same in case the petitioner-workman is still interested in pursuing the present remedy.

3. Ordered accordingly.


CWP-534-2001 (O&M)

1. In the present petition, the impugned award dated 14.09.2000 (Anneuxre P-12) has been challenged by the Bank on the ground that the workman has wrongly been granted the benefit of reinstatement in service by holding the termination of the workman from service is bad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Bank submits that qua the petition (CWP-12228-2003), which was filed by the respondent-workman by challenging the same impugned award, the same has been withdrawn on the ground that the learned counsel for the workman is not in contact with his client-workman.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-workman in the present petition also reiterates the same factual aspect as stated qua CWP-12228-2003 herein above.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Bank submits that as the respondent-workman is not coming forward to pursue the present remedy and the operation of the impugned award has already been stayed by this Court vide order dated 12.01.2001, the present petition i.e. CWP-534-2001 may also be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner-Bank to revive the same in case, respondent-workman initiate



CWP-12228-2003 (O&M)

-3-

any proceedings for the execution of the impugned order dated 14.09.2000 (Anneuxre P-12).

4. Ordered accordingly.

5. Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

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

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

04.08.2025

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: ~~Yes~~/No