

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

**109**

**(I) CWP-8482-2017  
Date of Decision : December 10, 2025**

**RAJESH KUMAR**

**-PETITIONER**

**V/S**

**PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, PATIALA AND  
ORS.**

**-RESPONDENTS**

**(II) CWP-7488-2017**

**MUKESH KUMAR**

**-PETITIONER**

**V/S**

**PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, PATIALA AND  
ORS.**

**-RESPONDENTS**

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

**Present:** Mr. Sanjeev Patiyal, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Gautam, Advocate, with  
Ms. Manreet Kaur, Advocate  
for the respondent No.2.

Mr. Karan Singla, Advocate  
for the respondent No.3.

**\*\*\***

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

1. Both these writ petitions are amenable for being decided through a common verdict on account of theirs clothing a common legal issue for adjudication.
2. The Industrial Tribunal, Patiala, through separate awards dated 21.10.2013, answered the reference in favour of the petitioners/workmen by holding that their termination was illegal on account of

infraction of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. However, instead of granting the relief of reinstatement, the Industrial Tribunal directed the respondent No.3 to pay a compensation of ₹30,000/- to each workman. Aggrieved by these awards, the petitioners have filed the present writ petitions.

3. On the previous date of hearing, i.e., 09.09.2025, this Court passed the following order:-

*“At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the limited prayer made in the instant writ petitions is with regard to enhancement in the compensation awarded by learned Tribunal concerned, specifically, when termination of services of the petitioner(s) were found to be in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He further submits that, indisputably, the petitioner(s) had worked with respondent No.3 for 11 years, and therefore, they are entitled for suitable compensation, whereas, the learned Tribunal has granted only Rs.30,000/-.*

*Faced with the above, learned counsel for respondent No.3 seeks an adjournment to have apt instructions from the quarter concerned, as to whether, respondent No.3-Management is ready and willing to pay a lump sum amount of Rs.5,00,000/- to the petitioners as compensation, to give a quietus to the dispute.*

*The asked for request is accepted.*

*Adjourned to 10.12.2025.*

*To be shown in the urgent list.*

*It is made clear that, on the subsequent date of hearing, no request for adjournment would be entertained on behalf of either side.*

*A photocopy of this case be placed on the file of connected case.”*

4. Today, learned counsel for the petitioners/workmen submits that the workmen are agreeable to the proposal made by this Court and are

willing to accept a lump-sum compensation of ₹5,00,000/- each. Similarly, learned counsel for the respondent No.3, upon having instructions from the quarter concerned, has made a positive statement that the respondent No.3 is ready to pay ₹5,00,000/- each to the workmen as lump-sum compensation to bring a quietus to the dispute once and for all.

5. In view of the consensus arrived at between the parties, **the impugned awards are modified to the extent that the respondent No.3 shall pay a sum of ₹5,00,000/- each to the petitioners/workmen as lump-sum compensation within six weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, failing which the said amount shall carry interest at the rate of 9% per annum.** It is clarified that any amount already paid to the petitioners/workmen pursuant to the impugned awards shall be adjustable against the lump-sum compensation now awarded.

6. Both these writ petitions stand **disposed of** accordingly.

7. A photocopy of this order be placed on file of connected case.

December 10, 2025  
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No