



CWP-6916-2000 (O&M)

1

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

(219)

CWP-6916-2000 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 07.04.2026

Indian Farmers Fertilizers Cooperative
Ltd. and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Gurgaon and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar Mutneja, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Viranjeet Singh Mahal, Advocate
Mr. Vishesh Bhatia, Advocate and
Ms. Suverna Mutneja, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, Advocate and
Mr. Aseem Aggarwal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners/Management, has challenged the legality of award dated 28.02.2000 (Annexure P-11), passed by learned Labour Court, Gurgaon (respondent No.1), whereby, the reference was answered in favour of the respondent No.2/workman, and he was awarded the relief of reinstatement with continuity of service but without back wages.

2. At the time of issuance of notice of motion, the Division Bench of this Court, through an interim order dated 29.05.2000, had stayed the operation of the impugned award. The instant writ petition is pending adjudication before this Court since the year 2000. In the meanwhile, the



the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short 'the ID Act'). During the pendency of the instant writ petition, the respondent No.2/workman, surpassed the age of superannuation, and therefore, the relief of reinstatement as awarded through the impugned award, is not possible, at this stage.

3. Learned senior counsel submits that though the relief of reinstatement cannot be given effect to. However, to set an example of model Management, they are ready and willing to settle this dispute, once and for all, by paying a lump sum compensation of Rs.1,50,000/-, to the respondent No.2/workman. He further submits that the petitioners were regularly making the payment as assessed under Section 17-B of the ID Act. Furthermore, learned Tribunal concerned, has not granted any back wages to respondent No.2/workman, while passing the award (supra).

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.2/workman, submits that since the respondent No.2/workman, has crossed the age of superannuation, therefore, the relief of reinstatement does not survive. Further, on instructions, he accepted the offer of lump sum compensation of Rs.1,50,000/-, to give a quietus to the *lis*.

5. In view of the consensus arrived at between the parties concerned, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, with a direction upon the petitioners to deposit lump sum compensation of Rs.1,50,000/-, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, in the bank account of the respondent No.2/workman, the details of which are mentioned below :-

Pritam Singh son of Medh Singh

A/c No.4129000100004706

MICR Code -110024418

IFSC Code-PUNB0412900



CWP-6916-2000 (O&M)

6. Needless to say, that in case, the above said payment is not made within the stipulate period, the respondent No.2/workman, would further be entitled for interest @ 9%, on the delayed payment.
7. Pending applications, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

April 07, 2026
Manpreet

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