

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

111

CWP-16595-2015

Date of Decision : November 27, 2025

SMT. SUNEHRI DEVI

-PETITIONER

V/S

**PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, HISAR AND ANR.**

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. Monika Khatri, Advocate, for
Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anurag Jain, Advocate, with
Mr. Aamol Singh, Advocate
for the respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant writ petition impugns the award dated 04.06.2015, whereby the respondent No.1- Industrial Tribunal, Hisar, has answered the reference against the petitioner/workman.

2. The petitioner/workman, who was appointed as a Dai/Attendant by respondent No.2/management on 07.10.1997, was served with a charge sheet and subsequently subjected to an inquiry in which the allegations against her were found to be established. Consequently, her services were terminated on 17.06.2013. The Industrial Tribunal held that the principles of natural justice were duly observed at every stage and found all objections raised by the petitioner to be legally untenable, thereby dismissing the challenge to the charge sheet and

termination order.

3. Though learned counsel for the petitioner attempted to assail the impugned award by seeking a re-appreciation of the entire evidence, this Court, not being an appellate authority but exercising only supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, refrained from delving into such reevaluation, particularly when no perversity or infirmity in the award was demonstrated by the petitioner's counsel. However, considering that the petitioner had admittedly rendered 16 years of continuous service with the respondent No.2, and that her termination arose out of a solitary incident, this Court, with a view to bringing a quietus to the dispute, proposed payment of a lump-sum compensation of ₹ 3,50,000/- to the petitioner. Accordingly, the following order was passed on 12.11.2025:-

“During the course of hearing, it transpires that the dispute as raised through the instant petition, can be given quietus, in case respondent no.2 agrees to pay a sum of Rs.3.50 lakhs as lump sum amount to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as respondent no.2, after having instructions from the respective parties, are directed to inform this Court regarding aforesaid proposal, on the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 27.11.2025.

To be shown in the urgent list.

It is made clear that no further request for an adjournment shall be entertained on the next date of hearing, on behalf of either of the parties.”

4. Today, learned counsel for the respondent No.2, while drawing attention of this Court to the gravity of the charges proved against the petitioner, submits that a reasonable amount may be awarded as lump-sum

compensation. He proposed to settle the matter by offering ₹ 2,50,000/- as a lump sum compensation to the petitioner.

5. This Court is of the opinion that the earlier proposed amount was determined after careful consideration of all facts and mitigating circumstances, and, as such, further negotiation is unwarranted. However, with the consent of learned counsel for both the petitioner and the respondent No.2, and solely with the objective of finally resolving the dispute, the instant writ petition is **disposed of** with a direction to the respondent No.2 to pay a lump sum compensation of ₹ 3,00,000/- to the petitioner within nine weeks from today.

November 27, 2025
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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