

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

117

CWP-1611-2020

Date of Decision : February 26, 2026

RAM LOK

-PETITIONER

V/S

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, S.A.S.
NAGAR, PUNJAB AND ORS.**

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Jaideep Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Laxman Choudhary, Advocate
for the respondents No.4 to 11.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. On the previous date of hearing, i.e. 06.02.2026, this Court
had passed the following order:-

“The instant writ petition is directed against the order dated 02.08.2019 (Annexure P-18), vide which, the claim application preferred by the petitioner-workman was dismissed, being settled.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though, claim application preferred by the petitioner-workman was dismissed as settled, but during the pendency of the proceedings before the learned Industrial Tribunal, a specific statement was made on behalf of the Management that case as regards regularization of the petitioner was under consideration. However, years have rolled by, but the matter has not made any tangible progress.

This Court has posed a specific query to the learned State counsel, as to whether, the case of the petitioner for regularization, in sync with the policies in vogue, has been

considered or not? In response, he prays for a short accommodation to have apt instructions in this regard.

The asked for request is accepted.

Adjourned to 26.02.2026.

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.”

2. Today, learned State counsel, upon instructions received from Ms. Jatinder Kaur, Principal, Government College, Rupnagar, informs the Court that the claim of the petitioner for regularization of service has already been duly considered and rejected by the competent authority, and a copy of the said decision has been annexed as Annexure R-1 to the reply dated 23.07.2021.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that neither have the complete back wages been paid to the petitioner, nor have the terms of the compromise been implemented or given effect to. Nonetheless, he seeks leave to withdraw the instant writ petition, with liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order rejecting his claim for regularization, and further to pursue appropriate remedy(ies) for enforcement of the terms of the compromise by filing an appropriate motion before the competent authority/forum.

4. Accordingly, the instant writ petition is **dismissed as withdrawn**, with liberty (*supra*).

February 26, 2026
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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