

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

**104**

**(I)**

**CWP-2342-2018 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision : March 07, 2026**

**DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, TERRITORIAL, GOVT. OF  
HARYANA, FOREST DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT KAITHAL**

**-PETITIONER**

**V/S**

**MITHOO @ KARNAIL AND ANOTHER**

**-RESPONDENTS**

**(II)**

**CWP-8915-2019 (O&M)**

**DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, TERRITORIAL,  
KURUKSHETRA**

**-PETITIONER**

**V/S**

**CHANDER SHEKHER AND ANOTHER**

**-RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present: Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*

**KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)**

1. The amenability of both these writ petitions for being decided through a common verdict generates from their encompassing common legal issue(s) for adjudication. For the sake of brevity and convenience, the facts are extracted from CWP-2342-2018.

2. The petitioner-management assails the award dated 29.09.2016 passed by the Labour Court, Ambala, whereby a bunch of references were answered in favour of the respondent No.1 and his co-workmen, and they were held entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and 50% back wages.

3. Concisely and compendiously, the respondent No.1 raised an industrial dispute by filing a demand notice/claim statement, averring that he was initially engaged in February 1991 under the Divisional Forest Officer (Territorial), Kurukshetra, at Machhrehri Forest Beat in Banpur Block of Saraswati Range, and subsequently, upon the establishment of the petitioner-management in the year 1997, he joined the petitioner as a labourer on daily-wage basis for plantation and maintenance of plants. He further averred that he continuously worked up to 08.07.2014, when his services were terminated without any written notice, termination letter, or retrenchment compensation. He also alleged that employees junior to him were retained in service while his services were terminated. The management, by filing its written statement, denied the claim of the workman, *inter alia*, on the ground that he never worked with it in the 12 months preceding the alleged date of termination. Upon appraisal of the submissions and evidence adduced by both parties, the Labour Court passed the impugned award in favour of the respondent No.1 and his co-workmen.

4. Since the impugned award was also passed in favour of the co-workmen of the respondent No.1, the management challenged the same by filing CWP No.12775 of 2019 and other connected writ petitions. In those writ petitions, learned counsel for the management submitted that the workmen had already been reinstated and were continuously in service since 2017, and that the only remaining issue for adjudication pertained to the quantum of back wages. Accordingly, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 05.09.2024, disposed of the said writ petitions by reducing the quantum of back wages from 50% to 30%.

5. Placing reliance on the order dated 05.09.2024, learned counsel for the management submits that the present writ petitions may also be disposed of in identical terms.
6. In view of the above, the **present writ petitions are disposed of in terms of the order dated 05.09.2024, passed in CWP No.12775 of 2019 and other connected writ petitions.**
7. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.
8. A photocopy of this order be placed on file of connected case.

**March 07, 2026**  
**devinder**

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)**  
**JUDGE**

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