

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:013658-DB



110

LPA No. 62 of 2025 (O&M)

Reserved on: 28.01.2025

Date of decision: 31.01.2025

Sat Narayan Sharma

....Appellant

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Patiala and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Vikas Arora, Advocate  
for the appellant.

SUDHIR SINGH, J.

C.M. No. 139-LPA of 2025

For the reasons given in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 25 days in filing the present appeal is condoned, subject to all just exceptions.

Main Case

Challenge in the instant intra Court appeal is to the order dated 20.09.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant-writ petitioner, was disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to comply with the order of the Labour Court within two months from the date of the order.

2. In the writ petition, the appellant had sought modification of the award dated 27.11.2013 (Annexure P-9) whereby the Labour Court had awarded a lump sum compensation of Rs.1,26,700/- to the appellant-workman. Vide the aforesaid award, the Labour Court instead of ordering re-instatement of the appellant-workman, had ordered payment of compensation to him, as noticed above.

3. The learned Single Judge had noticed the contentions of the parties i.e., the claim of enhancement of the compensation by the appellant-workman and the stand of the respondent-Management that the Units of the Management at Patiala and Yamuna Nagar had already been closed and it was difficult for the Management to pay even the amount awarded by the Labour Court. The learned Single Judge, while disposing of the writ petition has noticed that the award passed in favour of the appellant-workman has not been challenged by the respondent-Management till date and at the same time the compensation awarded has not been paid.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant has vehemently argued that the compensation awarded to the appellant is very much on the lower side and that keeping in view the long service period i.e., nearly 15 years; the last post held and the pay drawn by the appellant, he should have been paid some reasonable compensation. Reliance has been placed upon the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***Ram Manohar Lohia Joint Hospital and others Versus Munna Prasad Saini and another***, 2021(12) SCC 466 and the Division Bench judgment of this Court in ***Shiv Dayal Versus Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala and others***, 2017(2) Law Herald 1209 .

5. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have also gone through the impugned order.

6. The only question that requires consideration by this Court is whether the order passed by the learned Single Judge, requires any interference.

7. It is not disputed that the Units of the respondent-Management at Patiala and Yamuna Nagar stand closed. It is not the case of the appellant-workman that the Management is still running such Units. Under normal circumstances, this Court could have interfered in the award and the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge keeping in view the long tenure of service of the appellant-workman, but considering the fact that the Units of the respondent-Management at Patiala and Yamuna Nagar stand already closed, we find that no ground for interference is made out. The judgments referred to by the learned counsel for the appellant-workman are of no help to him keeping in view the peculiar facts of the present case.

8. In view of above, finding no merits, the present appeal is dismissed.

**(SUDHIR SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**31.01.2025**

*reema*

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)**  
**JUDGE**

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