



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

CWP-22518-2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.02.2026

Bahadur Singh Rajawat

....Petitioner

Versus

Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Gurgaon and
another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arvind Bansal, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1) The petitioner-workman has approached this Court by way of instant writ petition, as cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, against the award dated 17.07.2015 (Annexure P-8), vide which, learned Industrial Tribunal, owing to lack of territorial jurisdiction, answered the reference against him.

2) Before proceeding further, it would be expedient to refer to the order dated 22.01.2026, passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel for respondent No.2, at the outset, submits that they are ready to settle the dispute by paying a lump sum amount to the petitioner instead of contesting the instant petition. He, after receiving instructions from the concerned quarter, informs this Court that they are ready to pay a lump sum of Rs. 6,00,000/- (Rupees six lakhs only).



Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks an adjournment to have apt instructions in this regard or to put his own proposal before this Court on or before the next date of hearing.

The matter is adjourned to 17.02.2026.

To be shown in the urgent list.

It is made clear that no further request for an adjournment shall entertained on the next date hearing, on behalf of either of the parties.”

3) Today, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from the petitioner, who is present in Court, submits that he is ready to settle the matter, subject to payment of Rs.10,00,000/- as compensation.

4) In response, learned counsel for the respondent-Management, after having instructions from the quarter concerned, submits that the Management is inclined towards an amicable settlement, however, it cannot enhance the offer beyond a sum of Rs.7,00,000/-, which shall be in full and final settlement of the claim.

5) In the wake of the position set out above, it is evident that the parties are not joining issues on merits, rather, they intend to settle the dispute amicably. In this view of the matter, this Court is not required to delve into the merits of the matter. However, the only impediment in fructifying the settlement is the disparity in the quantum of compensation expected by the respective parties.

6) Accordingly, having regard to the total length of service rendered by the workman, and also the fair stand taken by the respondent-Management, this Court is of the considered view that the interest of justice would be served, if a compensation to the tune of



Rs.8,00,000/- is awarded to the petitioner-workman, to give a quietus to the matter.

7) Consequently, respondent-Management is directed to remit an amount of Rs.8,00,000/-, in the account of the petitioner-workman, details whereof are provided hereinbelow, within three months from the receipt of a certified copy of this order, failing which, he shall be entitled to 6% interest per annum, from the date of filing of this petition:-

Name: Bahadur Singh Rajawat
A/c No: 660010100020438
Bank: Bank of India
Branch: Vaishali Nagar Br. Jaipur (Rajasthan)
IFSC: BKID0006646

8) Accordingly, the impugned award stands modified to the extent indicated above, and the instant writ petition is **disposed of**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

17.02.2026

Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No