



CWP-24565-2017

1

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

(258)

CWP-24565-2017

Date of Decision : 06.11.2025

Rajendra Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

The Chief Conservator Officer,
Forest Department, Panchkula and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kapil Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a challenge is thrown to the award dated 05.06.2017 (Annexure P-4), passed by the respondent No.3, wherethrough, the reference was answered against the workman.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the claim of the petitioner has not been adjudicated on merits, rather referring to other litigations *qua* his earlier tenure of engagement with the respondents/Management, the impugned award (*supra*), was passed. Therefore, the same suffers from illegality, and requires interference of this Court.

3. No other argument was raised before this Court.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents/Management, submits that the petitioner/workman was earlier



CWP-24565-2017

2

engaged on 04.01.1996, and he worked upto 26.08.1998. Thereafter, post termination of his services, he raised the dispute by filing the claim statement, which subsequently vide reference was referred to learned Tribunal concerned, for its adjudication. The reference was decided upto the Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.1180 of 2010, decided on 13.02.2014, wherethrough, the petitioner/workman was granted compensation of Rs.2,00,000/-, as full and final settlement, and re-instatement into the job was declined.

5. This Court has perused the award (supra). The petitioner has set up his claim, to the effect, that he was re-engaged with the respondents/Management, on 01.07.2003, and worked upto 10.03.2012, and again his services were illegally terminated. Perusal of the award (supra), reflects that not even a single evidence was led to establish that the petitioner/workman was re-engaged, or worked upto 10.03.2012.

6. This Court has put a specific query to learned counsel for the petitioner/workman, as to whether, any positive evidence, or any efforts were made by the petitioner to brought on record any evidence, to substantiate his claim, to which, he answered in negative. It is a case of no evidence. Learned Tribunal concerned, has rightly answered the reference against the petitioner/workman, and therefore, no interference is required by this Court.

7. The instant writ petition is **dismissed**, accordingly.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

November 06, 2025
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No