



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

**LPA-3394-2024 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 17.03.2025**

**The Workmen through President, Their Dam Workers  
Union CITU (Natha Singh)**

**.....Appellant**

**Versus**

**The State of Punjab and others**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present: Appellant in person,  
along with Mr. Tahaf Bains, Advocate.

Mr. Kuljit Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*

**SUDHIR SINGH (ORAL)**

The challenge in the instant intra Court appeal is to the order dated 18.10.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court, whereby writ petition (CWP-14358-2000) filed by respondent-State of Punjab and others was disposed of by modifying the Award dated 22.02.2000 (Annexure P-11 with the writ petition) passed by the Labour Court to the extent that the workers would be entitled to benefit of uniform and washing allowance with effect from the demand notice i.e. 22.07.1999.

2. Before the learned Single Judge, the respondent-State of Punjab had laid challenge to the award dated 22.02.2000, whereby the Labour Court had ordered to pay uniform and washing allowance to the respondent-workmen. As would appear from the order passed by the learned Single Judge, the writ petition was admitted only with regard to the retrospective operation given to the Award from 01.01.1996 (uniform allowance) and 01.04.1996 (washing allowance) and the same was dismissed in other aspects. Subsequently, the respondent had filed CM-2790-2006 seeking stay of operation of the impugned award to the extent of liability for the period from 1996 to 1999. Vide order dated 16.03.2007, the said application was allowed.

3. Learned Single Judge, after hearing the rival contentions, disposed of the writ petition, as noticed above.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant has vehemently argued that while passing the impugned order, the learned Single Judge has completely lost sight of the documents annexed with the writ petition. He has further argued that the management had deliberately concealed the relevant facts inasmuch as the management had prolonged the claim of the workmen by assuring them that the matter was under consideration of the Government, which is reflected in the written statement filed by the Management before the learned Tribunal. It is also argued that the appellant had approached the Pay Commission in 1994 i.e. much before

01.01.1996, which is also reflected from the written statement of the Management. It is also argued that in plethora of cases, the Hon'ble Courts had granted the benefit to the employees/workmen for 38 months prior to the filing of the writ petition and the period from January, 1996 to December, 1998 comes to less than 36 months.

5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge.

6. In our opinion, the only question that arises for consideration in the present appeal is, whether the impugned order requires any interference by this Court.

7. A perusal of the impugned order would show that the demand notice was served on 22.07.1999; the impugned Award was passed on 22.02.2000 and the Tribunal had granted washing allowance at the rate of Rs.30/- per month w.e.f. 01.04.1996 at par with Class IV employees and further directed the Management to pay the uniform allowance to the workmen of all categories of regular and work-charged employees at the rate of Rs.100/- per month w.e.f. 01.01.1996. Admittedly, the demand notice was served on 22.07.1999 and therefore, the finding of the learned Single Judge that the workmen cannot be allowed to grant of such benefit from the date, which they did not claim, cannot be said to be illegal or perverse.

8. As noticed above, the only limited question regarding which, the writ petition was admitted, was in respect of the retrospective operation given to the Award passed by the learned Tribunal. In our opinion, once the workmen had submitted a demand notice in respect of their claim, the benefit arisen therefrom has rightly been held to be operative from the said date itself and not from an earlier date. We find that the order passed by the learned Single Judge is perfectly valid and no indulgence is required to be granted to the appellant in the present appeal. The order passed by the learned Single Judge, therefore, does not suffer from any infirmity or perversity.

9. In view of the above, finding no merits, the present appeal is hereby dismissed.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(SUDHIR SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)**  
**JUDGE**

17.03.2025

Ajay Prasher

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