



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

**CWP-24279-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 12.09.2025**

Principal, Sant Nischal Singh Public School, Ladwa, and others  
....Petitioners

Versus

Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala and  
another  
....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present: Ms. Supriya Garg, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**KULDEEP TIWARI, J.** (Oral)

1. A reference made under Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (for short, 'the Act of 1947'), has been answered in favour of respondent No.2-workman by the learned Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala, vide award dated 28.05.2025, (Annexure P-8), thereby, directing the petitioner-Management to reinstate him to the same post on which he was working prior to his termination, with continuity of service, along with 50% back wages, as last drawn by him, from the date of termination till reinstatement.

2. Aggrieved, the petitioner-Management has approached this Court by way of instant writ petition, under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Certiorari to quash the award (supra).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, in light of the Haryana Government notifications dated 08.09.2005, 28.05.2008



(No.18/18/07-2HBIV), and 07.05.2013 (No.7/45-2010 PS(2)), vide which, it was notified that disputes pertaining to Educational Institutions are to be adjudicated by specially constituted Educational Tribunals, therefore, the learned Industrial Tribunal concerned did not have the jurisdiction to decide the reference (supra). She further submits that the notifications (supra), were issued, in compliance to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **TMA Pai Foundation and others Vs. State of Karnataka, 2002 (8) SCC 481.**

4. She asserts that notification dated 28.05.2008 (Annexure P-5), specifically reflects that, for the redressal of grievances of employees of aided/unaided Medical/Dental Ayurvedic/Homeopathic Educational Institutions, who are subjected to punishment or termination of services, appropriate Tribunals would be constituted. Further, the right to file appeals would lie before the learned District & Sessions Judge or Additional District & Sessions Judge, till such Tribunals are set up. Further, it is submitted that, through notification No.7/45-2010 PS(2) dated 07.05.2013, it was clarified that schools are also included in the definition of Educational Institutions. Therefore, post issuance of the notification(s) (supra), any employee working with the petitioner, which is an Educational Institution, has the only remedy to approach the Educational Tribunal, for redressal of any dispute. In such circumstances, since the learned Industrial Tribunal did not have the jurisdiction to pass the award, under challenge, the same is *void ab initio*. She concludes by submitting that the instant writ petition deserves to be allowed, thereby setting aside the impugned award.

5. No other argument was raised before this Court.



6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the petitioners, and perused the record.

7. The only question which arises for determination of this Court is, as to whether, the learned Tribunal concerned has the jurisdiction to adjudicate the reference, and pass the impugned award?

8. Before proceeding with the matter, this Court is reminded that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has categorically held that the remedy under the Act of 1947, cannot be overpowered by any special law. *Ex facie*, the issue, as referred to above, is no more *res integra*, as a Division Bench of this Court has already considered the same, in a bunch of appeals, lead case being **LPA-1908-2018 (Savitri Devi Vs. Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court and others)**, decided on 12.09.2024. For the sake of clarity, it would be expedient to extract the relevant part of the verdict (*supra*), and the same reads as under:-

*“ 1. These intra Court appeals have been filed against the order dated 13.09.2018, passed by learned Single Judge, whereby, the challenge made to the award passed by the Labour Court dated 14.03.2017 was upheld. The award dated 14.03.2017, decided the reference with regard to illegal termination from service against the workman by holding that in view of the alternative remedy of approaching the educational Tribunal, constituted pursuant to the Apex Court's decision in '**T.M.A. Pai Foundation & others vs. State of Karnataka & others**', **2003(2) SCT 385**, the reference was not maintainable.*

*2. It appears that the Labour Court as well as learned Single Judge were oblivious of the decision of this Court rendered by the Full Bench in the case of '**Ambala Central Co-op. Bank Limited Ambala Vs State of Haryana and***



**others', 1993(2) S.C.T. 310**, where similar dispute was adjudicated upon by holding thus:-

*“7. In view of the consistent decisions referred to above specifying the scope of the authorities under the Cooperative Societies Act. the Civil Court and the Labour Court and the remedies available there-under, the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in the Kapurthala Central Cooperative Bank Limited v. State of Punjab, (supra), does not lay down the law correctly. In this case it was held that the employee of a Co-operative Society having elected his remedy of filing an appeal under the provisions of the Act and failed there could not get the matter referred through the State to the Labour Court under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It was also held in this case that the decision of the authorities under the Cooperative Societies Act, Registrar of the Co-operative Societies) would operate as res judicata. Since the dispute between the workmen and the Bank in the present case related to establishment of the Society, it could be referred to the Arbitrator under Section 102 and adjudicated under section 103 of the Act reproduced above. Jurisdiction of the Civil Court would obviously be barred to challenge those decisions. However, Industrial Disputes Act dealing with the special subject relating to rights of the workman and the management and the relief provided therein could only be granted by the Court established under the Industrial Disputes Act. Section 128 of the Haryana Cooperative Societies Act was rightly held to be ultra vires i.e. the remedies available under the Industrial Disputes Act could not be denied to the workman of the management, a Co operative Society. In that sense the order of the Registrar passed under*



*the provisions of the Co-operative Societies Act cannot be treated as a decision final to operate as res judicata in the Labour Court in a reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act. Obviously when the order itself is under challenge the same cannot operate as res judicata. To sum up, it is held that after the Registrar decides the matter between an employee and employer, a Co-operative Society, with regard to the termination of his service under Sections 102 and 103 of the Haryana Cooperative Societies Act, 1984 the matter could be referred under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act as an industrial dispute to the Labour Court for adjudication. It is further held that such a decision made by the Registrar under the Haryana Co-operative Societies Act would not operate as res judicata in proceedings initiated on reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act in the Labour Court.*

*8. The matter be put up before the Division Bench for further proceedings.”*

*3. It was held by the Full Bench that remedy available under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 cannot be excluded by any other special law. Therefore, it is available to the workman, irrespective of availability of other alternative remedy. As such, it appears that the decision rendered by the Labour Court as well as learned Single Bench, is per incuriam the view of Full Bench in the case **‘Ambala Central Co-op. Bank Limited Ambala Vs State of Haryana and others’, 1993(2) S.C.T. 310 .***

*4. Similar view has recently been taken by this Bench on 05.09.2024, while allowing the LPA-1204-2017, titled as **“Jagjit Singh Vs. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Ludhiana and another”.***



*5. In view of the above, the impugned order dated 3.09.2018, passed by learned Single Judge as well as the award dated 14.03.2017 passed by the Labour Court are set aside.”*

9. In view of the position sketched out above, there is hardly any scope for this Court to re-examine the issue, which has already been settled by the Hon’ble Supreme Court, and as demonstrated above, has been followed by the Division Bench of this Court. Therefore, it can safely be concluded that the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner do not carry any merit.

10. In summa, the instant writ petition is **dismissed**.

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)**  
**JUDGE**

**12.09.2025**  
Ak Sharma

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes    |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |