



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

CWP-18004-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.03.2026

Director, State Transport, Punjab and another

....Petitioners

Versus

President/General Secretary, Punjab Roadways, Worker's Union,
Chandigarh and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Amit Goyal, Additional Advocate General, Punjab,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Kaith, Advocate,
for respondents No.1 and 2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners, by way of instant writ petition, as cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, impugn the award dated 06.10.2016 (Annexure P-1), vide which, the learned Industrial Tribunal, has set aside the orders dated 04.01.2008 and 15.01.2008, passed by the petitioner-Department.

2. In essence, in the year 1999, workman (Sh. Baldev Singh) was granted the benefit of Assured Career Progression Grade on completion of 24 years of service, and he superannuated on 31.10.2007. However, vide order dated 04.01.2008, the said benefit was withdrawn, and consequently, his pay was reduced on account of re-fixation, vide order dated 15.01.2008. Thereafter, even the recovery was effected from his retiral benefits. Aggrieved, the workman, through the Punjab Roadways Worker's Union, raised an industrial dispute.

3. Upon consideration of the matter, and applying the ratio carved out in the **State of Punjab and others Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) and others, 2015 (4) SCC 334**, the learned Industrial Tribunal quashed the orders (supra). Resultantly, the workman was held entitled



for release of the amount, which was deducted from his retiral benefits. In this backdrop, the State-Management is before this Court.

4. At the outset, this Court has been informed that the amount, which is a bone of contention, is Rs.16,890/-. Astonishingly, the State has been pursuing the litigation since 2012, for a meager amount of Rs.16,890/-. By now, the workman is around 75 years old, and ironically, he has been dragged up till this Court to defend the proceedings in his twilight days, for the abovesaid amount.

5. Faced with the above, learned State counsel, upon having apt instructions, submits that he would not press this petition, provided that, it does not create any precedent for any person/employee to take advantage of the observations made by the learned Tribunal.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 is not averse to the abovesaid proposal.

7. In view of the above, the instant writ petition is **dismissed, being not pressed**. However, it is clarified that anything observed by the learned Tribunal shall not enure to the benefit of any other employee.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

19.03.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No