



**246+247 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of Decision : 26-03-2025

1. CWP-6493-2019 (O&M)

**DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER (TERRITORIAL), MEHAM
ROAD, BHIWANI**

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

JAGDISH AND ANR.

.....Respondent(s)

2. CWP-6526-2019 (O&M)

DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER (TERRITORIAL) BHIWANI

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAJESH KUMAR AND ANR.

.....Respondent(s)

3. CWP-6530-2019 (O&M)

**DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER (TERRITORIAL), MEHAM
ROAD, BHIWANI**

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

BIMLA AND ANR.

.....Respondent(s)

4. CWP-6531-2019 (O&M)

**DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER (TERRITORIAL), MEHAM
ROAD, BHIWANI**

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

ISHWAR AND ANR.

.....Respondent(s)

5. CWP-6567-2019 (O&M)

**DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER (TERRITORIAL), MEHAM
ROAD, BHIWANI**

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

SATYAWAN AND ANR.

.....Respondent(s)

6. CWP-8872-2019 (O&M)

**DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER (TERRITORIAL), MEHAM
ROAD, BHIWANI**

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

PHOOLPATI AND ANR.

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, DAG Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

. Present bunch of six writ petitions the details of which have been mentioned in the heading involve common question of law in the context of common set of facts and thus they are being decided by a common order.

2. In the present bunch of petitions, the challenge is to the impugned award dated 03.11.2016, copy of which has been appended as Annexure P-1, by which, the respondent(s)-Workman were reinstated in service but without backwages.

3. The prayer of the petitioner-Department is that though, the services of the respondent(s)-Workman were terminated but as they had not completed 240 days of service, petitioners were not required to follow Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Department argues that the details of the payments from June, 2012 to May 2013 were produced and according to the said payments, the respondent(s)-Workman had not completed 240 days of service.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the records of the present bunch of cases with his able assistance.

6. A bare perusal of the impugned award dated 03.11.2016 (Annexure P-1) would show that even as per the payments made, nothing evident has come on record to show that the service of the respondent(s)-Workman were less than 240 days in the preceding year prior to their termination.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Department was asked to point out from evidence and the facts placed on record of the Labour Court that the respondent(s)-Workman had worked for less than 240 days but the learned counsel for the petitioner-Department has not been able to rebut the same.

7. Further, it may be noticed that the respondent(s)-Workman had already been reinstated in service by compliance of the award dated 03.11.2016 (Annexure P-1) and are working for the last approximately 8-9 years. The endeavour of the petitioner-Department is to throw out the respondent(s)-Workman from the Department so that they may not claim the regularisation of their services.

8. It may be noticed that the present bunch of writ petitions have only been filed to stop the respondent(s)-Workman for claiming the regularisation rather than challenging the aforementioned award on the ground permissible.

9. Once, no perversity in the impugned award has been shown to this Court qua the findings recorded by the Labour Court in the impugned award dated 03.11.2016 (Annexure P-1), no ground is made out for any interference in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

10. Hence, the present bunch of six petitions stands dismissed.

11. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

12. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

26-03-2025
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES
Whether reportable: NO