



CWP-22272-2019

1

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

(241)

CWP-22272-2019

Date of Decision : 14.10.2025

Jasmer Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Managing Director, Pepsu Roadways Transport
Corporation, Nabha Road, Patiala and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Devyansh, Advocate for
Mr. Ravi Gakhar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. The petitioner/workman, has thrown a challenge to the award dated 10.05.2019 (Annexure P-1), passed by the learned Industrial Tribunal, Patiala (respondent No.1), whereby, the learned Tribunal though answered the reference in favour of the petitioner/workman, and held termination of his services illegal, on account of infraction of Section 25(f) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the ID Act'). However, the learned Tribunal concerned, instead of granting re-instatement in service, has awarded a meagre compensation of Rs.70,000/-. This caused the grievance to the petitioner/workman, and he preferred the instant writ petition, under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, challenging the award (supra).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner while placing reliance upon the judgment passed in intra Court appeal bearing No.LPA-2078-2014 and other



CWP-22272-2019

2

connected matters, decided on 19.11.2015, submits that the petitioner/workman has worked continuously w.e.f. 03.03.2001 to 26.07.2008, therefore, the learned Tribunal concerned, instead of granting Rs.70,000/-, should have granted adequate compensation, i.e. at least Rs.30,000/- for each year, for the services rendered by him.

3. Succinctly, the petitioner was appointed as a Driver, on contract basis, w.e.f. 03.03.2001 to 26.07.2008. Thereafter, his services were terminated, vide order dated 27.07.2008, and at that point of time, he was getting salary of Rs.3,250/- per month. The contract of employment of the petitioner was revoked, on account of remaining absent from duty. Post passing of the termination order, the petitioner served a demand notice on 12.05.2014, and on failure of the conciliation proceedings, the dispute was referred to the learned Industrial Tribunal, for adjudication under Section 2-A and Section 10 (1) (c) of the ID Act. The learned Tribunal found that the services of the petitioner/workman were illegally terminated, without compliance to the provisions of Section 25(f) of the ID Act. However, while placing reliance upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Haryana State Electronics Development Corporation Ltd. versus Mamni**' 2006(2) LLJ Page 744 (SC), by the learned Tribunal concerned, the petitioner/workman was denied the relief of re-instatement rather, only a meagre compensation was granted.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner placed emphasis only with regard to inadequate compensation, and therefore, only the said issue has been examined by this Court. The learned Tribunal has granted the compensation of Rs.70,000/- only, whereas, there is no dispute that the petitioner had worked from March 2001 to July, 2008. The issue of quantum of compensation has



CWP-22272-2019

3

already been considered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***CWP No.11057 of 2001, titled 'State of Haryana vs. Surjeet and another'*** decided on 30.07.2025.

5. This Court has considered the judgment passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, and there is no dispute with regard to the ratio laid down therein. However, in the instant case, since the petitioner/workman, has worked from March 2001 to July 2008, therefore, this Court considers that the petitioner/workman, is entitled for a lump sum compensation, which is to be calculated @ Rs.50,000/- for each year, the workman had worked with the respondent No.1/Management. The compensation amount shall be paid to the petitioner/workman, within a period of four weeks, from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. In case, there is a failure on the part of the respondent No.1/Management, to pay lump sum compensation, within the stipulated period, the petitioner/workman, would further be entitled for interest @ 8% per annum.

7. With the aforesaid observations, the instant writ petition is **disposed of.**

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

October 14, 2025
Manpreet

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