

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**CWP No.14953 of 2024****Date of Decision: 22.09.2026**

Nanal Hydro Power Consultancy Pvt. Ltd.Petitioner

Versus

Norang ... Respondent

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Dr. Lalit K. Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Vishal Singh Thakur, Advocate.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the award dated 21.10.2024 passed by learned Presiding Judge, Labour Court- cum- Industrial Tribunal, Kangra at Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh, in Reference No. 101 of 2021, titled **Sh. Norang vs. The Director, Nanal Hydro Power Consultancy Private Limited**, whereby the Court below, while answering the reference under Section 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act (**for short 'Act'**), though held respondent-workman entitled to reinstatement of his service on daily wage basis from the date of his termination i.e. 07.04.2020 and all the consequential benefits of continuous service since the year 2018 but without back wages and granted compensation to the tune of

¹ Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

Rs. 1,00,000/- in lump sum on account of illegal retrenchment, petitioner-employer has approached this Court in the instant proceedings filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, praying therein to set aside the aforesaid award.

2. Before the case at hand could be heard and decided on its own merits, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, made an offer that in case respondent-workman is ready and willing to give up his claim with regard to reinstatement, the amount of compensation awarded by the Court below can be enhanced.

3. While responding to aforesaid offer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Vishal Singh Thakur, learned counsel representing respondent-workman, contended that respondent-workman is otherwise entitled to sum of Rs. 2,50,000/- for his having worked with effect from 2024 to 2026 i.e. during the pendency of the present petition and as such, compensation awarded by Court below to the tune of Rs. 1,00,000/- cannot be said to be adequate, rather needs to be enhanced substantially for the reason that prior to his being disengaged, respondent-workman rendered services for the period from 16.08.2018 till 07.04.2020 and during this period, he was being paid sum of Rs. 10,000/- per month.

4. Having taken note of aforesaid statement made by Mr. Vishal Singh Thakur, learned counsel for the respondent, coupled with the offer made by learned counsel representing petitioner-employer to pay compensation in lump sum, this Court deems it fit to enhance the amount of compensation awarded by Court below from Rs. 1,00,000/- to Rs. 4,50,000/- for the reason that admittedly during the period starting from 2018 till 2020, respondent-workman was working and during this period, he was being paid salary of Rs. 10,000/- per month, which in total comes out to be Rs. 2,40,000/-. Now, since on account of the impugned award, respondent-workman, who is 33 years of age, has been held entitled to reinstatement and can definitely continue to work for another 10 years, as such amount of compensation, as ordered to be enhanced, can be said to be very reasonable.

5. Consequently, in view of the aforesaid discussion and with the consent of the parties, present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms, as a consequence thereof, impugned award dated 21.10.2024 shall stand modified to the extent that respondent-workman though shall not be entitled to reinstatement, but in lieu thereof, petitioner-company shall pay him sum of Rs. 4,50,000/- in lump sum within a period of three weeks. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

6. List for compliance on 31.10.2026.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

September 22,2026
(shankar)