



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(232)

CWP No. 20858-2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 05.05.2025

Punjab Pradesh Galla Mazdoor Union, Amritsar

...Petitioner

Versus

Registrar Trade Union, Punjab-cum-Labour Commissioner, Punjab and
another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Amarjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Akshita Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Ms. Kuljit Kaur, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order dated 08.09.2015 (Annexure P-7) vide which the representation filed by the petitioner-Union that another Union by the same name has been registered, which is incorrect.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that two Mazdoor Union with the same name have been registered whereas, the petitioner-Union was registered by Registration No. 55 in the year 1984 and the subsequent Union has been registered under the same name by Registration No. 16 of 2015. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no two Union can carry out the same name and the said fact has been ignored while registering the respondent No. 2-Union.



3. Upon notice of motion, the respondents have filed the reply, wherein, the respondents have stated that though, two registered Union have been registered under the same name but, as the office bearers of the Union are different, the same is good enough, hence, the prayer of the petitioner has rightly been rejected while passing order dated 08.09.2015 (Annexure P-7).

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

5. Nothing evident has come on record to show that two Union can be registered under the same name. From bare perusal of the registration number of the petitioner as well as respondent No. 2 would show that they both have been registered under the name of 'Punjab Pradesh Galla Mazdoor Union' hence, merely that the Executive of two Union is different or the office bearers are different, will not suffice the issue.

6. The order dated 08.09.2015 (Annexure P-7) rejecting the representation is set-aside and the case is remanded back to the Labour Commissioner, Punjab-respondent No. 1 to decide the issue once again by keeping in view the fact that two Union under the same name cannot be registered.

7. Present petition is disposed of accordingly.

8. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

May 05, 2025
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No