



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

126

CR-5530-2025

Date of decision: 19.08.2025

DAINIK BHASKAR CORPORATION LIMITED PETITIONER
VERSUS
GURPREET SINGH AND OTHERSRESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. P.S. Khurana, Advocate with
Mr. Ajay Kamboj Gurpreet, Advocate and
for the petitioner.

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is aggrieved by the impugned order dated 29.07.2024 (Annexure P-7) passed by the learned Civil Judge (Senior Division) Fatehgarh Sahib in EXE/156/2024. Admittedly respondent-workman/Gurpreet Singh had filed a petition before Industrial Tribunal, which was allowed vide order dated 27.02.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, Union Territory Chandigarh.

Aggrieved by said *ex parte* order against petitioner, it approached this Court vide CWP No.9178 of 2025 (Annexure P-5) and the same is stated to be fixed for 05.11.2025.

Notice of motion was issued by this Court vide order dated 22.04.2025 and in the meantime, workman had preferred execution bearing No.156 of 2024 titled as "***Gurpeet Singh Vs. Dainik Bhaskar Corporation Limited and others***". In the said execution, the employer i.e. petitioner had preferred an application seeking stay of execution on the ground that its writ petition bearing No. 9178 of 2025 is pending before this Court and therefore proceedings to execute award be stayed. However, learned Executing Court recording the finding that no stay is in operation against execution proceedings and accordingly dismissed the said application.



Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that stay of the award was not necessary, as the pendency of the appeal ought to have been duly taken into consideration by the learned Executing Court. It is also argued that until the writ petition is finally decided, the learned Executing Court ought not to have proceeded with the execution petition.

I do not find any merit in the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner. Once an award is passed, the learned Executing Court is bound to execute the same, unless there exists valid and justifiable reasons. One such reason could be stay order passed by a higher Court. However, in the present case, no stay is operating against the execution of award dated 27.02.2025 (Annexure P-1). Therefore, learned Executing Court was bound to proceed with the execution and recover the amount under the award. The only remedy with the present petitioner was to approach this Court in CWP No.9178 of 2025 and seek appropriate orders. No fault with the impugned order dated 29.07.2025 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned Executing Court can be found and the same is hereby upheld.

Accordingly, the present revision petition is dismissed. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to seek his legal remedies before the appropriate forum in accordance with law.

Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

19.08.2025

Kusum

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether Reportable</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |