

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

108

CWP-25962-2025

Date of Decision : January 27, 2026

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Sunil K. Tandon, Advocate (Through V.C.)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Nitesh Jhahria, Advocate, and
Mr. Prativindya Poonia, Advocate
for the respondent No.3.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. On 02.09.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“1. Through the instant writ petition, challenge is thrown to the order dated 15.01.2024, whereby the claim petition filed by the workmen under the Payment of Wages Act has been allowed and the petitioner and private contractor have been held liable, jointly and severally, to pay an amount of ₹ 1,85,000/- along with compensation of ₹ 1000/- to each workman within a period of one month.

2. The impugned order has been assailed on the ground that the petitioner had already made payment to the private contractor, and it is for the contractor to make further payment to the workmen. Therefore, the authority concerned ought not to have, without ascertaining whether the complete contractual amount had been paid to the private contractor or not, held the petitioner jointly and severally liable to pay the awarded amount.

3. Notice of motion for 15.01.2026.

4. In the meantime, operation of the impugned order shall remain

stayed only qua the petitioner.”

2. Subsequently, on the previous date of hearing, i.e. 15.01.2026, this Court had directed learned counsel for the respondent No.3 to have instructions as to whether, in terms of the averment (*supra*) made on behalf of the petitioner, the respondent No.3 had received the entire contractual amount.

3. Today, learned counsel for the respondent No.3 has submitted that the respondent No.3 has received the complete contractual amount, and that a dispute subsists between the respondent No.3 and the workmen. Further, while submitting that the respondent No.3 intends to file objections before the learned Executing Court, he fairly concedes that the petitioner bears no liability towards payment of the amount, and that the respondent No.3 is willing to indemnify the petitioner in the event of any loss being occasioned to him.

4. In view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the respondent No.3, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not wish to press the present writ petition.

5. Accordingly, the present writ petition is **dismissed, as not pressed.**

January 27, 2026
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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