



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

CWP-2899-2015

Date of Decision : 02.02.2026

SATNAM SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

PRESIDING OFFICER & ORS.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Deepanshu Mehta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Walia, AAG, Punjab

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, as cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a challenge is thrown to the Award dated 24.09.2013 (Annexure P-9), passed the learned Industrial Tribunal (respondent no.1), whereby, the reference made upon a demand notice of the petitioner-workman, answered against him.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was non-suited only on account of delay and latches, as he had approached the learned Industrial Tribunal concerned, after a lapse of four years.

3. He further submits that the aforesaid delay on the part of the petitioner, was not intentional, which he had explained before the learned Industrial Tribunal concerned. It had been specifically mentioned by the

petitioner that he had earlier approached the wrong forum, i.e. Consumer Court concerned, which lead to the aforesaid delay. Even otherwise under Section 10-C of the the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, there is no limitation period prescribed.

4. This Court has put a specific query to learned counsel for the petitioner, as to whether, the petitioner has been non-suited only on the ground of delay and latches or any other grounds, to which, he answered that the petitioner has been non-suited only on the ground of delay and latches.

5. The submission, so made by learned counsel for the petitioner, was refuted by learned State counsel by submitting that the petitioner has been non-suited on two grounds; first, the services of the petitioner have not been terminated, rather, his services were dispensed with on completion of his contract, and; second, that on account of appointment of incumbent, his services were dispensed with.

6. When, this Court confronted learned counsel for the petitioner, as to why, he has not mentioned about the second issue upon which reference of the petitioner was answered against him, to which he is unable to answer.

7. This Court does not appreciate the manner, in which the arguments have been advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner.

8. Further, a perusal of the Award clearly reflects that the petitioner, had duly participated in the regular appointment process, and he could not succeed therein. Thereupon, on completion of his 89 days *ad hoc* service contract, and upon appointment of regular incumbent to the post, services of the petitioner were dispensed with, and it cannot be

considered as a termination from service falls within the ambit of retrenchment defined under Section 2(oo) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

9. In view of the above, no interference is required by this Court in the well reasoned Award, as has been passed by the learned Industrial Tribunal concerned. Consequently, the instant petition, is hereby, **dismissed**.

10. All pending application(s), if any, also stand **disposed** of accordingly.

February 02, 2026
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No