

2025:PHHC:131687



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

**115**

**CWP-28178-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 22.09.2025**

**PATANJALI AYURVEDA LIMITED**

**-APPLICANT/PETITIONER**

**V/S**

**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

**-RESPONDENTS**

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

Present: Mr. Jeevan Gautam, Advocate with  
Mr. Punit Jain, Advocate,  
for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl.AG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

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

**CM-14092-CWP-2025**

1. Leave granted.

**CWP-28178-2025**

2. Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner-management seeks a quashing of an interim order dated 13.08.2025 (Annexure P-1), whereby, the application to lead additional evidence was dismissed by the learned

2025:PHHC:131687



Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Panipat (respondent no.2).

3. Succinctly stated, the petitioner-management is facing proceedings before the learned Tribunal concerned, in a reference originated on account of a demand notice served by the workman (respondent no.3 herein). After framing of the issue, both, the workman and the petitioner-management led their respective evidence. The workman concluded his evidence on dated 20.11.2024. Thereafter, the petitioner-management was granted 3-4 effective opportunities to lead their evidence. Finally, on dated 15.01.2025, a last opportunity was afforded to the petitioner-management. However, on account of failure on the part of the petitioner-management to conclude its evidence, again the matter was adjourned for 05.03.2025. On the said date as well, the petitioner-management failed to close its evidences. Thereupon, vide a court order, the evidence of the petitioner-management was closed on dated 05.03.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner-management filed an application on dated 26.03.2025 for granting one more opportunity to the petitioner-management to lead evidence. However, that application was dismissed, vide the order dated 13.08.2025, which was put to challenge before this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, while drawing attention of this Court towards various *zimni* orders, submits that there was no endeavour on the part of the petitioner-management to delay the

2025:PHHC:131687



conclusion of the proceeding in the reference in question.

5. He further submits that the first opportunity, was granted to lead evidence on dated 11.12.2024 and thereafter, the evidence was closed within three months, i.e. on 05.03.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner-management within 20 days filed an application to lead additional evidence i.e. on 26.03.2025, which clearly reflects that all due care was taken by the petitioner-management to produce the evidence, therefore, the learned Tribunal concerned, ought to have granted the petitioner-management at least one opportunity to defend themselves.

6. He also submits that in case the impugned order is allowed to be sustained, then it would tantamount to scuttle the principle of natural justice.

7. Notice of motion, at this stage, to respondents no.1 and 2 only.

8. Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl.AG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents no.1 and 2 and waives service.

9. Considering the fact that the only issue involved in the instant matter, is with regard to the leading of additional evidence, and there seems to be no inordinate delay on the part of the petitioner-management, therefore, at this stage, without issuing notice to the workman (respondent no.3), which would unnecessarily burden him with the litigation expenses, an interference in the impugned order is being

2025:PHHC:131687



made by this Court.

10. The facts as observed above reflects that there is no inordinate delay on the part of the petitioner-management. They should have been given adequate opportunity to defend themselves by leading evidence. A perusal of the record shows that the petitioner-management was granted only three months time to conclude its evidence. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner-management be granted one more opportunity to lead the evidence to defend themselves. However, the interest of the workman, is also required to be considered. Accordingly, an opportunity is granted to the petitioner-management to lead additional evidence, if any, subject to the payment of Rs.25,000/- to the workman, which shall be deposited before leading the evidence, with the learned Tribunal concerned.

11. In case the petitioner-management makes a compliance of the direction (*supra*), the learned Tribunal concerned, shall grant one opportunity to lead their additional evidence.

12. It goes without saying that, only one effective opportunity shall be afforded to the petitioner-management to lead their additional evidence. The learned Tribunal concerned, shall also inform the petitioner-management, as well as the workman, about the date fixed for leading additional evidence.

13. Since the instant order has been passed in the absence of

2025:PHHC:131687



respondent no.3 (workman), considering the innocuous and *bona fide* prayer in the instant petition, in case the workman fetches any grievance from this order, he is at liberty to file an apt motion before this Court, for revival of the instant petition.

14.           **Disposed of** accordingly.

**September 22, 2025**  
*dharamvir*

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

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned. | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable.        | : | Yes/No |