



201

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

RSA-52-1999 (O&M) &
XOBS-4-C-1999 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.01.2026

Chander Bhan Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Haryana Seeds Development Corporation Limited

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: None.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. The present appeal and cross-objections arise from a suit which was filed in the year 1992. The trial Court had disposed of the suit with the following observations:-

“RELIEF.

18. In view of my finding on issue No. 1, the suit of the plaintiff is decreed against defendant No.1 for declaration to the effect that the impugned order of punishment dated 22.5.1989 Ex.P6 terminating the services of the plaintiff issued by defendant No.1 is illegal and void and not binding on the plaintiff and the plaintiff, therefore, continues to be in the service of the defendant No.1 as Manager and is entitled to reinstatement forthwith and to all the consequential benefits. Defendant No.1 is directed through a mandatory injunction to reinstate the plaintiff in the service forthwith and to give him



all the consequential benefits, alongwith interest thereon @ 6% per annum from the date of accrual till the date of realisation. However, it shall be open to defendant No.1 to conduct a fresh enquiry against the plaintiff on the same allegations strictly in accordance with the service Rules to the plaintiff and the principles of natural justice. Costs of the suit are allowed to the plaintiff. Decree sheet be prepared accordingly. File be consigned to the record room.”

2. Appeal was filed by the respondent and the judgment of the trial Court was modified with the following observations:-

“22. Due to the reasons stated above I am of the view that the decree passed by the learned trial court in this case requires a minor modification. Now the suit of the plaintiff/respondent stands decreed. The impugned order dated 22.5.89 (Ex.P6) terminating the service of the plaintiff is held to be illegal and void. It is held that the plaintiff is entitled to reinstatement. He shall, however, be entitled to wages/salary w.e.f. the date of decree passed by the learned trial court i.e. on 2.4.96. Appellant is at liberty to hold fresh inquiry against the respondent/plaintiff which shall be held without any delay and shall be completed within six months from today. At the time of conclusion of the inquiry the competent authority shall be entitled to regularise the period of the plaintiff from the date of dismissal i.e. 22.5.89 till the date of decree dated 2.4.96 as per the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The appeal accordingly stands disposed of. Decree-sheet be prepared.

Announced: 10.6.98”

3. Plaintiff has filed the present Regular Second Appeal. A perusal of the zimni orders would show that no interim order is in favour of the plaintiff. Respondent has filed cross-objections. There is no interim



order even in the said cross-objections.

4. None has appeared on behalf of the appellant as well as cross-objector to inform the Court as to whether any cause survives in the present appeal or not.

5. Accordingly, the present appeal and cross objections are disposed of.

6. Liberty is granted to the appellant and cross objector to revive the same in case any cause survives.

7. Registry is directed to send a copy of the present order to both the parties at the address given in the memo of parties.

08.01.2026
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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