



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

**CWP-7725-2001 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 10.12.2025**

CHET RAM

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

**PRESIDING OFFICER LABOUR COURT II, FARIDABAD AND
ANOTHER**

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Ms. Gurneet Kaur, Legal-aid-Counsel,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kapil Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

Since there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner today as well, therefore, Ms. Gurneet Kaur, Advocate (P/5279/2018, Mobile No.9478381131), who is present in Court, is appointed as legal-aid-counsel, on behalf of the petitioner, to assist this Court in the instant matter.

She will be paid the fee from the corpus of legal-aid-counsel of this High Court.

CWP-7725-2001 (O&M)

1. Through the instant petition cast under Article 226/227 of the

Constitution of India, a challenge is thrown to the Award dated 03.12.1999 (Annexure-P-2), passed by respondent no.1, on the ground that only 10% back wages have been granted, instead of full back wages.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the termination order of the petitioner was found to be illegal by the learned Tribunal concerned, on account of infraction of Section 25-F of the the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, despite that he was only granted only 10% back wages, with no reason assigning for depriving the petitioner-workman for full back wages.

3. This Court has considered the submission, as made by learned counsel for the petitioner, and has also perused the impugned Award.

4. In the instant case, the petitioner-workman worked with respondent no.2 from 1st July, 1994 to 31st December, 1994, whereas, his services were terminated without compliance of Section 25-F of the Act.

5. It is the case of the petitioner-workman, that he was engaged as a mason, and his salary was only Rs.2,200 per month. It is not the case that the petitioner was appointed through any selection process. The petitioner-workman had worked only from 1st July, 1994 to 31st December, 1994, that too on muster-roll, and thereafter, he continuously worked for two months in the year 1995.

6. Since the petitioner-workman, had worked for only 08 months in total, this Court is of the considered view that the instant petition can be **disposed of**, by modifying the impugned Award, to the

effect that the petitioner-workman is entitled for reinstatement into service, with 25% of the back wages.

7. **Ordered** accordingly.

December 10, 2025
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No