



CWP-44-2020

1

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

(247)

CWP-44-2020

Date of Decision : 11.02.2026

Harpal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. Kashish Mehta, Advocate for
Mr. Jitender Singh Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Pratibha Bali, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the legality of the award dated 02.02.2018 (Annexure P-1), as passed by the learned Industrial Tribunal, Ludhiana (respondent No.2), has been put to challenge, where through, the reference was answered against the petitioner/workman, holding that there exists no master and servant relationship between the petitioner/workman and the respondent/Management.

2. Succinctly, through the claim statement, it was pleaded by the petitioner/workman, before the learned Tribunal concerned, that he was employed by the PSPCL, on permanent basis as Complaint Handling, on 01.10.2011, and his monthly wages were fixed at Rs.10,250/-, at the time of his appointment. He worked continuously upto 01.10.2012. However, his services were illegally terminated on 01.10.2012, without giving him any notice, or chargesheet etc. The claim statement was referred to as reference under Section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short 'the ID



Act'), to adjudicate on the issue, as to whether, the termination of services of the petitioner/workman, was illegal or unjustified.

3. The respondent No.3/Management, contested the claim statement, on the ground, that there does not exist any relationship of employer and employee, between the petitioner and the respondent No.3.

4. Both the parties led their respective evidence, and the learned Tribunal concerned, concluded that there is no evidence on record to establish that there exists the master and the servant relationship between the petitioner and the respondent No.3/Management, therefore, the reference was answered against the petitioner/workman.

5. Though, learned counsel for the petitioner has made an endeavour to point out perversity or illegality in the impugned award. However, she is unable to point out any cogent evidence, which could establish that the petitioner/workman, was employed by the respondent No.3/Management, rather, what surfaced from perusal of cross-examination of the petitioner/workman, when he stepped into the witness box, as WW-1, is that he clearly admitted that he worked only under respondent No.2-M/s. Rajindra Electricals and Electronics.

6. Since learned counsel for the petitioner has been unable to point out any perversity or illegality in the impugned award, therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that impugned award does not require any interference of this Court.

7. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **dismissed**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

February 11, 2026
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No