



**224 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP-169-2015
Date of decision: 24.09.2025**

**THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR OFFICER FOREST DEPARTMENT
HARYANA AND ORSPetitioners**

Versus

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER LABOUR COURT AMBALA AND
ANRRespondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

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

Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate for respondent-Workman.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J (ORAL)

1. The Forest Department-Management, fetching grievance from the award dated 24.03.2014 (Annexure P-5), passed by the learned Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala, has approached this Court, through the instant writ petition, cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, whereby, the reference has been answered in favour of the respondent-workman, and she has been granted the relief of re-instatement on the same post with continuity in service, and full back wages from the date of issuance of demand notice, i.e 15.11.2011 and all other consequential benefits.

2. At the outset, learned State counsel- petitioner apprises this Court that respondent No.1-workman, post passing of the award (supra), is working with the petitioner/Management-Forest Department, and therefore, the only issue, which requires consideration, is with regard to the payment of full back wages. He further informs this Court that a similar issue has arisen before a Coordinate Bench of this Court, in a bunch of petitions, lead case being CWP-22006-2017, which was decided on 05.09.2024, thereby reducing the back wages from 50% to 30%. The relevant paragraph of the verdict (supra), is extracted hereinafter:-



“17. Considering the fact that workmen have already been re-engaged, they are working since their re-engagement and they had not worked during the period from retrenchment to reinstatement, this Court finds it appropriate to reduce the amount of back wages from 50% to 30%. The said amount shall be paid within three months from today and it would not carry interest.”

3. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1-workman does not dispute the judgment (supra), and submits that he has no objection, in case, the matter at hand is also disposed of, in similar terms.

4. In view of the above, the impugned award is modified, only to the extent that the back wages, as granted to the workman by the learned Industrial Tribunal concerned, are reduced to 30%.

5. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**.

24.09.2025

monika

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes /No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes /No