



RA-LP No. 26 of 2025 in LPA No. 1782 of 2018

-1-



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

**RA-LP No. 26 of 2025 in  
LPA No. 1782 of 2018**

**Reserved on: 25.07.2025  
Pronounced on: 31.07.2025**

NATHU RAM

PETITIONER

VS.

PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT AND ANOTHER

RESPONDENTS

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present:- Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate, for the applicant-respondent No.2

Mr. K.K.Khetarpal, Advocate, for non-respondent Nathu Ram.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJIV BERRY, J.**

1. The instant application has been preferred by applicant respondent-No.2 seeking modification of the judgment dated 12.09.2024 passed by this Court in LPA No. 1782-2018.

2. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant-respondent No.2 that vide judgment dated 12.09.2024, the LPA No. 1782-2018 was disposed of by directing respondent No.2 to pay compensation of ₹6 lakh in lieu of reinstatement to the petitioner within 30 days from the date of the order, failing which, same shall carry interest @ 8% per annum from the date of passing of the award i.e. 13.08.2009. He submits that due to transfer of dealing clerk, the order could not be complied in time, however, immediately on coming to the know about the passing of the order, the applicant ensured the payment of the amount of compensation of ₹6 lakh by



RA-LP No. 26 of 2025 in LPA No. 1782 of 2018

-2-



way of cheque dated 19.02.2025 which was duly received by the counsel for the petitioner. He contends that the delay had been non intentional on the part of the applicant and seeks modification of the interest clause.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has disputed this aspect by submitting that the judgment dated 12.09.2024 was passed in the presence of the counsel for the applicant-respondent No.2, therefore, the knowledge aspect qua the judgment, cannot be disputed.

4. Before proceeding further, the relevant portion of the judgment dated 12.09.2024 passed in LPA No.1782 of 2018 is reproduced here as under:-

*“11. After having considered all the relevant aspects and submissions of learned counsel for rival parties, this Court is of the considered view that an amount of Rs. 6 lakh compensation, in lieu of reinstatement, would suffice. The said amount shall be paid to the workman within a period of 30 days, from today, failing which, the same shall carry interest @ 8% per annum from the date of passing of the award i.e. 13.08.2009”*

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record and also considering the fact that the judgment dated 12.09.2024 was passed in the presence of learned counsel representing respondent No.2, it would not be appropriate for respondent No.2 to plead that he/she was not aware of the passing of the judgment. However, considering the fact that during pendency of the proceedings the applicant-respondent No.2 had already paid the compensation awarded vide judgment dated 12.09.2024 amounting to ₹6 lakh by way of cheque dated 19.02.2025 to the petitioner, the instant application is disposed of by modifying the para No.11 of the



RA-LP No. 26 of 2025 in LPA No. 1782 of 2018

-3-



judgment dated 12.09.2024 passed in LPA No. 1782 of 2018 to the extent as under:-

*“11. After having considered all the relevant aspects and submissions of learned counsel for rival parties, this Court is of the considered view that an amount of Rs. 6 lakh compensation, in lieu of reinstatement, would suffice. The said amount shall be paid to the workman within a period of 30 days, from today, failing which, the same shall carry interest @ 8% per annum from the date of passing of this order i.e. 12.09.2024”*

6. With the aforesaid modification, the application stand disposed of.

**(SANJIV BERRY)**  
**JUDGE**

**(SHEEL NAGU)**  
**CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Dated: 31.07.2025**

*Gyan*

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No