



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

227-8

**Decided on :30.04.2025**

**1. RA-CW-258-2018 in CWP-2913-2016 (O&M)**

NAVNEET SINGH

. .Petitioner

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-I CHD & ORS

. . . Respondents

**2. RA-CW-263-2018 in CWP-2918-2016 (O&M)**

SHADI LAL

.Petitioner

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-I CHD & ORS

. . . Respondents

**3. RA-CW-259-2018 in CWP-3212-2016 (O&M)**

KAMALPREET SINGH

. .Petitioner

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-I CHD & ORS

. . . Respondents

**4. RA-CW-262-2018 in CWP-3229-2016 (O&M)**

DALJIT SINGH

. .Petitioner

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-I CHD & ORS

. . . Respondents

**5. RA-CW-252-2018 in CWP-3187-2016 (O&M)**

TAJINDER PAL SINGH

. .Petitioner

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-I CHD & ORS

**6. RA-CW-264-2018 in CWP-3169-2016 (O&M)**

NISHAN SINGH

. .Petitioner

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-I CHD & ORS



**RA-CW-258-2018 in  
CWP-2913-2016 (O&M)  
and connected cases -2-**

7. **RA-CW-260-2018 in CWP-2914-2016 (O&M)** . . . Respondents

BALDEV SINGH

. . .Petitioner

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-I CHD & ORS

. . . Respondents

8. **RA-CW-261-2018 in CWP-2952-2016 (O&M)**

KULWANT SINGH

. . .Petitioner

V/S

PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-I CHD & ORS

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

PRESENT: Mr. R. K. Chauhan, Advocate and  
Mr. Ankush Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. R. Kartikeya, Advocate for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)**

1. By this common order, a set of seven cases, the details of which have been given in the heading, are being disposed of together as all the cases involve the same question of law on similar facts. For the sake of convenience, facts are drawn from CWP No. 2913 of 2016.

2. In the present review applications, the prayer of the review-applicants is that the claim of the review applicants/petitioner has been dismissed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court while passing order in CWP No. 2913 of 2016 on 07.08.2018 (Annexure A-1) and the said writ petition has been disposed of in view of the judgment passed in **CWP No. 19592 of 2015 titled as Zonal Manger, Punjab and Sind Bank, Jalandhar and others versus Sukhwinder Singh and others, decided on 07.08.2018.**

3. Learned counsel for the review applicants/petitioner submits



**RA-CW-258-2018 in  
CWP-2913-2016 (O&M)  
and connected cases -3-**

that the controversy raised before this Court by filing CWP No. 19592 of 2015 by the respondent-Bank against award dated 24.02.2015 passed by the Labour Court was that the employees, who were similarly situated to the petitioner, after termination of their services was held to be bad by the said order of labour Court and were granted the compensation amounting to Rs. 2 lakhs, which quantum of compensation was under challenge by respondent-bank in the said petition. Learned counsel for the review applicant further submits that the review applicant/petitioner who was similarly situated to other employees was not granted the compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs which quantum of compensation was granted to other similarly situated employees rather he was only granted with the compensation of Rs. 23,000/- which was neither adequate nor at par with the amount that similarly situated employees received, which has arisen the question of discrimination between the similarly situated employees and the review applicant/petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the review applicant further submits that all the petitions were heard together and the challenge qua the quantum of compensation awarded by the labour Court in its award dated 24.02.2015 granting the compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs to the similarly situated employees at the hands of respondent-bank was dismissed by the Court by order dated 07.08.2018. Learned counsel for the review applicant/petitioner further submits that once the said writ petition was dismissed, the claim of the petitioner/review applicant ought to have been allowed so as to avoid the discrimination between the employees as the petitioner was also claiming the maximum compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs which was awarded in the favour of the similarly situated employees.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents has not been able to dispute



**RA-CW-258-2018 in  
CWP-2913-2016 (O&M)  
and connected cases -4-**

the fact that the plea of the respondent-bank against the grant of the compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs to the workman was dismissed by order dated 07.08.2018.

6. That being so, dismissing the claim of the petitioner will be discriminatory as two contrary orders cannot be passed by the same Court in the same judgment. Hence, the review applications filed by the petitioners are allowed and the writ petitions are restored to its original number and status.

**Main Case:**

1. On the asking of the learned counsel for the parties, the writ petitions filed by the petitioners are being taken up for consideration today itself. For the sake of convenience, facts are taken up from CWP No. 2913 of 2016.

2. The ground being taken by the petitioner before this Court to challenge the award of the labour Court dated 09.04.2015 (Annexure P-3) as far as the grant of compensation of Rs. 23000/- is concerned, is based on the award dated 24.02.2015 passed by the Labour Court in case of another employees including one Sukhwinder Singh, whose services were also terminated alongwith petitioner herein and upon challenge qua the said order of termination the said Sukhwinder Singh and others similarly situated employees, were granted a compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs instead of benefit of reinstatement in service.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the once the benefits of compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs has been granted to similarly situated employees, grant of compensation of Rs. 23,000/- to the petitioner is not only bad but also amounts to discrimination between the similarly



**RA-CW-258-2018 in  
CWP-2913-2016 (O&M)  
and connected cases -5-**

situated employees, and hence, the said discrimination needs to be removed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that while passing the order in *CWP No. 19592 of 2015 titled as Zonal Manger, Punjab and Sind Bank, Jalandhar and others versus Sukhwinder Singh and others, decided on 07.08.2018* filed by the respondent-Bank, the grant of compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs to Sukhwinder Singh and other similarly situated employees by labour Court has also been upheld by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and therefore, the award dated 09.04.2015 (Annexure P-3) in favour of the petitioner herein should also be modified so as to entitle the petitioner to get compensation in the tune of Rs. 2 lakhs.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-Bank has not been able to dispute the said factual position that the employees whose services were also terminated alongwith the petitioner herein, who had also raised the grievance before the labour Court had been granted the benefit of compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs instead of the benefit of reinstatement in service, which award of the labour Court has already been upheld by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

7. The issue raised by the petitioner in the present petition is as to whether the benefit of grant of compensation @ Rs. 23000/- to the petitioners herein in the facts and circumstances of the present case is adequate or the same needs to be modified to the extent of what the similarly situated employees have received. Learned counsel for the respondent-Bank has not been able to dispute the fact that the employees whose services were terminated alongwith the petitioner, who had approached the labour Court



**RA-CW-258-2018 in  
CWP-2913-2016 (O&M)  
and connected cases -6-**

for the grant of relief against the termination and their services were also found to be in-contravention of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, have been granted with the compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs. The the said award of the labour Court has been upheld by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court while passing order dated 07.08.2018 in CWP No. 19592 of 2015. Once, the similarly situated employees including one Sukhwinder Singh, whose services were terminated alongwith the petitioner, have been granted with the benefit of compensation to the tune of Rs. 2 lakhs, therefore, in the light of said factual matrix the petitioner cannot be discriminated by denying the grant of said compensation of Rs. 2 Lakhs.

8. The petitioners are entitled for the same benefit which has been granted to the other similarly situated employees. Even the Courts are bound to follow the said rule of law unless and until there are differentiating factors which could allow for reasonable classification so as to pronounce different orders. In the present case, no such differentiating factors have been pointed out by the learned counsel for the respondent-Bank with regard to the petitioner as well as the similarly situated employees to whom the compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs has been granted by the labour Court.

9. Keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances of the present case, **the present petitions are allowed by modifying the impugned award to the extent that instead of granting compensation amount to the tune of Rs. 23,000/-, the petitioner-workman in all the writ petitions are held entitled for a compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs.**

10. It may be noticed that while passing order in CWP No. 19592 of 2015, the liberty was granted to the bank to approach the District Sainik Welfare Board, in case they have any liability qua the said Board, the same



**RA-CW-258-2018 in  
CWP-2913-2016 (O&M)  
and connected cases -7-**

liberty is granted to the respondent Bank in the present petitions, as was granted in *CWP No. 19592 of 2015.*

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

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)  
JUDGE**

**30.04.2025**

*Riya*

*Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*

*Whether Reportable: Yes/No*