



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

**217**

**LPA-827-2018 (O&M)**

**DATE OF DECISION: 13.10.2025**

**... Appellant (s)**

**MAHESH KUMAR**

**Versus**

**THE PRINCIPAL, DELHI PUBLIC SCHOOL AND ANR.**

**... Respondent(s)**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present: Mr. G.S. Bal, Senior Advocate with  
Ms. Gurneet Kaur, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Advocate for respondent No.1.

\*\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)**

The appellant has impugned the judgment of the Single Bench dated 23.04.2018 whereby the writ petition preferred by him challenging the award of the Labour Court has been disposed of and instead of directing reinstatement, the lumpsum compensation of Rs.70,000/- awarded by the Labour Court has been increased to Rs.3,50,000/-.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant was employed with respondent No.1-School as a Driver and his services had been wrongly terminated and therefore, he ought to have been reinstated with continuity in service. In the alternative, he submits that the compensation of Rs.3,50,000/- needs to be enhanced as the appellant had served continuously for over 7 years as a Driver and was drawing a salary of Rs.12,500/- per month.

3. Heard.

4. The appellant, who is stated to have been working as a Driver with the respondent, had been terminated from service on 02.06.2009. He had raised an industrial dispute and the Industrial Tribunal by award dated 23.04.2018 had arrived at the conclusion that the termination was contrary to the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act,1947 and had directed lumpsum compensation of Rs.70,000/- instead of reinstatement. The Single Bench had enhanced the compensation to Rs.3,50,000/- as the appellant had worked for over 7 years.

5. A coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Sukhbir Singh Vs. State of Haryana and others, LPA No.1203 of 2021, decided on 01.03.2023**, after taking into consideration the judgments of the Supreme Court had held that compensation of Rs.50,000/- for each year of service would be just and adequate. The relevant extract of the judgment is reproduced hereunder:

“xxxxxx

*6. Resultantly, once the workman had completed 240 days and apparently had worked for a period spanning more than 5 ½ years, we are of the considered opinion that dispensing of his service before his contractual period came to an end would entitle him for the statutory protection which would be evident from the award of the Labour Court. However, keeping in view the fact that at this point of time, it would not be justified to put him back in service since a period of almost 25 years has gone by and therefore, it would be just and appropriate to award compensation to the tune of Rs.2,50,000/- on an average of Rs.50,000/- per year, keeping in view the fact that the State had taken his service for more than 5 years with the same office in different districts.*

Xxxxxx”

6. Therefore, we are in agreement with the Single Bench enhancing the compensation from Rs.70,000/- to Rs.3,50,000/-. The appellant had worked for 07 years and thus compensation has been determined at Rs.50,000/- for each year. Consequently, the Letters Patent Appeal stands dismissed and the amount of compensation would be disbursed to the appellant along with interest within a period of one month from now.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for respondent No.1 submits that the compensation amount has already been disbursed to the appellant.

8. However, in the event that the compensation amount has not been disbursed, the same would be payable to the appellant along with interest at the rate of 6% per annum w.e.f. 23.04.2018 within a period of two months from now, failing which, it will draw interest at the rate of 9% per annum.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)  
JUDGE**

**(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)  
JUDGE**

**13.10.2025**

SwarnjitS

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