



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

CWP-32983-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.05.2026

Stylam Industrial Limited
Versus
....Petitioner

Amit Kumar and others
....Respondents

CWP-39431-2025 (O&M)

M/s Stylam Industrial Limited
Versus
....Petitioner

The Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court, Ambala, Haryana and another
....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Prashant Kapila, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. R.C. Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. **CWP-39431-2025** is preponed from 20.07.2026, to today.
2. Since the same impugned order is put to challenge vide both the above captioned writ petitions, the same are taken up together for disposal.
3. On 12.05.2026, this Court had directed the Managing Director of the petitioner-company, along with the authorized signatories, who have filed the petitions to remain present on the adjourned date. What constrained this Court to call upon the abovesaid officer/officials of the petitioner-Management is to unravel the truth for challenging the same award dated 15.07.2025, by instituting two separate writ petitions.
4. It appears that when this Court, while issuing notice of motion in CWP-32983-2025, vide order dated 07.11.2025, did not grant any interim order, the petitioner-Management devised another way to try its luck in securing an interim order, i.e. to file another petition, i.e. CWP-39431-2025. Accordingly, vide order dated 08.01.2026, while



issuing notice of motion, this Court stayed the payment of back wages to the extent of 50%.

5. However, when the petitioner filed CM-7699-7700-CWP-2026, for withdrawal of CWP-32983-2025, the abovesaid factual aspect of the matter came to the knowledge of this Court. The relevant part of the order dated 12.05.2025, reads as under:-

“Through the instant application, a prayer has been made for withdrawal of the main petition, on the ground that respondent no.1- workman, has already joined the petitioner-company.

Learned counsel for respondent no.1-workman, who has caused appearance through virtual platform, submits that the petitioner-management has played fraud with the judicial system, as the Award dated 15.07.2025, passed in favour of respondent no.1-workman, has been put to challenge subsequently, before this Court by way of CWP39431-2025, which is pending for consideration on 20.07.2026 and in this matter, the petitioner-management has obtained an interim direction against the Award vide order dated 08.02.2026.

He further submits that since the petitioner-management failed to get any interim relief in the instant petition, they made an endeavour to file CWP-39431-2025 subsequently, for the same cause of action, with a sole motive to get interim relief, and in which they very well succeeded.

Prima facie, this Court is of the view that the petitioner adopted fraudulent means to obtain stay against the impugned Award. Before this Court take necessary action, including the criminal action, against the petitioner-management, the authorised signatory and the Managing Director, of the petitioner-company are directed to cause their personal appearance before this Court on the next date of hearing. Failing which, this Court would proceed to resort to coercive methods to secure their presence.”

6. In deference to the abovesaid direction, Mr. Jagdish Gupta, Managing Director, along with Mr. Dhiraj Kheriwal, Company Secretary-A.R. (in CWP-32983-2025) and Mr. Harish Jamwal, H.R. Head (in CWP-34931-2025), is present in Court.



7. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not intend to join the issues, as the error is apparent on the part of petitioner-Management. He has also furnished an unconditional apology of the Managing Director, in the form of a duly sworn affidavit, for filing two separate petitions assailing the same award. Further, since the workman has been dragged to defend the proceedings in two petitions, the petitioner-Management shall pay him an amount of Rs.50,000/-, as litigation expenses. Lastly, he, on instructions, seeks permission to withdraw both the petitions.

8. The reason spelt out in the affidavit for filing two petitions through different Advocates, is that the same were filed by two different offices of the petitioner-Management due to mis-communication and ignorance, as the HR Head was not informed about filing of the second writ petition.

9. In the wake of the above, this Court accepts the unconditional apology tendered on behalf of the petitioner-Management, and the affidavit is taken on record as Mark 'A'. As a result, the petitioner is permitted to withdraw both the writ petitions.

10. **Dismissed as withdrawn.**

11. However, the petitioner-Management shall remit an amount of Rs.50,000/- to the workman, as litigation expenses within 15 days from today. In the event of default, the workman is at liberty to get both the petitions revived, by moving appropriate application.

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

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

14.05.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No