



CWP-1724-2001 and
CWP-454-2002

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(209)

Date of Decision : 15.01.2026

1. CWP-1724-2001

Director, Pt. B.D. Sharma, Postgraduate Institute
of Medical Sciences, Rohtak ...Petitioner

Versus

Raj Pal and another ...Respondents

2. CWP-454-2002

Raj Pal ...Petitioner

Versus

Director, Pt. B.D. Sharma, Postgraduate Institute
of Medical Sciences, Rohtak and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Advocate
Ms. Manreet Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-1724-2001 and
for respondent No.1 in CWP-454-2002.

Mr. Ravinder Singh Saroha, Advocate
for respondent No.1 in CWP-1724-2001 and
for the petitioner in CWP-454-2002.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Both these petitions are amenable to be decided together, as the common award dated 30.05.2000 (Annexures P-4 and P-10) respectively, passed by the learned Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Rohtak, has



**CWP-1724-2001 and
CWP-454-2002**

been put to challenge, before this Court, by the Management, as well as, the workman. Therefore, the same are taken up together for adjudication.

2. The reference was answered in favour of the workman, whereby, he was awarded the relief of reinstatement on his previous post and continuity of service with 60% back wages. The management has challenged the award (supra), by filing CWP-1724-2001, and the workman has filed CWP-454-2002, before this Court, wherethrough, he has prayed that he is entitled for 100% back wages, instead of 60% back wages, as awarded by the learned Tribunal concerned.

3. The instant writ petition, as filed by the Management, is pending adjudication before this Court, since the year 2001, and no stay was granted to the impugned award, which resulted into the reinstatement of the workman, with the petitioner/Management.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner/Management before this Court that the workman is still working with the petitioner/Management, and is about to retire on attaining the age of superannuation.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner/Management in CWP-1724-2001, submits that she restricts her prayer only on the issue of 60% back wages, as awarded to the workman. She further submits that on the principle of '*No Work No Pay*', the workman is not entitled for the back wages.

6. During the course of the arguments, a consensus has been arrived at between the parties concerned, as per which, the impugned award dated 30.05.2000, passed by the learned Industrial Tribunal cum Labour



**CWP-1724-2001 and
CWP-454-2002**

Court, Rohtak, is ordered to be modified, only to the extent, that the workman is entitled for 30% back wages, only.

- 7. In view of the above, both the instant petition(s) are **disposed of**.
- 8. Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected case file, as numbered above.

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE**

January 15, 2026
Manpreet

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