

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

112

(I) CWP-35850-2019

Date of Decision : February 12, 2026

DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, TERRITORIAL

-PETITIONER

V/S

SANJAY AND ANOTHER

-RESPONDENTS

(II) CWP-36115-2019

DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, TERRITORIAL

-PETITIONER

V/S

JAGVINDER LAL @ JAGVINDER AND ANOTHER

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

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

Mrs. Jaishree Kaushik, Advocate
for the respondent No.1 (in CWP-35850-2019).

Mr. Aman Nain, Advocate
for the respondent No.1 (in CWP-36115-2019).

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The amenability of both these writ petitions for being decided through a common verdict generates from theirs encompassing common legal issue(s) for adjudication. For the sake of brevity and convenience, the facts are extracted from CWP-35850-2019.

2. The petitioner-management assails the award dated 29.01.2018, passed by the Labour Court, Ambala, whereby the reference(s) was 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 from the date of termination.

3. Concisely and compendiously, the respondent No.1 raised an industrial dispute by filing a demand notice/claim statement, averring that he was appointed under the management for the plantation and maintenance of plants in Pai and Serdha Beat under Pundri Range, District Forest Officer, Kaithal, in January 2000. He further averred that he continuously worked up to July 2016, 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 had not completed 240 days of work in the preceding twelve months. Upon appraisal of the submissions and evidence adduced by both parties, the Tribunal 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. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent No.1 fairly concede that the issue arising for consideration in the present writ petitions is squarely covered by the order dated 05.09.2024. Therefore, on instructions, they raise no objection to the disposal of the present writ petitions in terms of the said order.

7. 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.**

8. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

9. A photocopy of this order be placed on file of connected case.

February 12, 2026
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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