



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

CWP-10129-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 06.04.2026

Gurindar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Imran Farooqi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking quashing of Award dated 08.03.2025 passed by National Lok Adalat, Ferozepur (for short 'NLA'). He is further seeking order restraining the Respondent No. 5 from deducting Rs. 18,500/- per month from his salary.

2. The petitioner is a Class IV employee serving as Beldar in the Public Works Department, Division Sirhind No.2, District Fatehgarh Sahib (for short 'PWD'). He resides in Basant Nagar, Khanna, Ludhiana. He is the sole breadwinner of his family. His family sought financial assistance from Respondents No.6 to 12 on two occasions. A sum of Rs. 30,000 was transferred on 17.02.2025 in his wife's account by one Kamal Dhaliwal and another sum of Rs. 20,000/- was transferred on 25.02.2025 by one Manoj Dhawan. He claims that Respondents are indulged into the illegal business of money-lending without any authority or license under the Punjab Registration of Money Lenders Act, 1938. They obtained his signatures on several blank papers and blank cheques. They misused the same to manufacture a fictitious 'Pronote and Receipt'

antedating it to 08.08.2024 thereby fabricating a loan document amounting to Rs. 10,00,000/- bearing interest @ 2% per month. Respondent No. 4-Mehta Finance Company instituted a recovery suit against him. A compromise was effectuated on 08.03.2025. Petitioner claims that his statement was falsely recorded and he did not willingly enter into compromise to the extent of outstanding liability of Rs. 9,62,000/-. NLA vide Award dated 08.03.2025 gave directions to the petitioner's department-Executive Engineer, PWD B&R (Respondent No. 5) to deduct installment of Rs 18,500/- per month from his salary for 24 months and credit the same to Bank Account of Respondent No.3.

3. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner has partially complied with impugned order, thus, there is no question of fraud or coercion.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

5. From the perusal of record, it is evident that NLA has passed impugned order on the basis of compromise executed between the parties. In the absence of evidence of fraud or coercion, there seems no reason to interfere with impugned order.

6. In the wake of aforesaid discussion and findings, the petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly ***dismissed***.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

06.04.2026
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No