



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

102

**(1) LPA-1910-2023
Date of Decision: 01.09.2025**

**Gurdaspur Cooperative Sugar Mills Limited
....Appellant**

Versus

**Special Secretary, Cooperation Punjab and others
....Respondents**

(2) LPA-1912-2023

**Gurdaspur Cooperative Sugar Mills Limited
....Appellant**

Versus

**Special Secretary, Cooperation Punjab and others
....Respondents**

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

Present: Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate for the appellant(s).

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

CM-4801-LPA-2023 in LPA-1912-2023

This is an application under Section 151 CPC for condonation of delay of 05 days in re-filing the appeal.

Keeping in view the facts mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 05 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.



LPA-1910-2023

-: 2 :-

LPA-1912-2023 and LPA-1910-2023

1. Both the LPA's are being disposed of together through a common order as common question of law is involved in both the cases.
2. In both the appeals, the challenge is to the order dated 17.08.2023 passed in CWP-26610-2016 and CWP-26611-2016 by the learned Single Judge by which, the writ petition(s) filed by the appellant, challenging the order dated 20.10.2016 passed by respondent No.1 in the revision petition, were dismissed.
3. On being asked to point out any perversity in the impugned order dated 17.08.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge either on facts on record or qua settled principles of law, learned counsel for the appellant submits that though, it is a matter of fact that as of now all the employees against whom, the allegations were alleged have been exonerated by the authorities concerned but, the conclusion of revision petition qua other employees is still pending though, in the case of respondents herein, the same filed by the appellant has been dismissed.
4. We have heard the learned counsel for the appellant and have gone through the record with his able assistance.
5. Once, after due application of mind, the authorities concerned have passed an order holding that the allegations alleged against the respondents were not correct and by a detailed order, the benefit of exoneration has been granted to the respondent-employee, which fact has also been appreciated by the learned Single Judge, the intention of the appellant is to re-argue the same so as to convince the Court to arrive at another decision



LPA-1910-2023

-: 3 :-

than the one arrived at by the authorities concerned, which has been upheld by the learned Single Judge.

6. Unless and until, the impugned order is perverse to the facts on record or law, the same cannot be interfered by this Court even if two views are possible after appreciation of the facts. In the present cases, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant has not been able to show that the order passed by the authorities granting the relief to the respondents, which has been upheld by the learned Single Judge, is perverse either to the facts on record or on law.

7. Further, once a view has been taken by the authorities as well as by the learned Single Judge which is consistent, in the absence of any perversity, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present cases.

8 Accordingly, both the appeals are dismissed.

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

10. Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

September 01, 2025

Varinder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No