



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**



D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) Petition No. 44/2024

In

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7886/2008

1. Secretary-Cum-Member, Rajasthan State Pollution Control Board, 4 Street, Institutional Area, Jhalana Doongri, Jaipur.
2. Senior Pollution Engineer Adm., Rajasthan State Pollution Control Board, 4 Street, Institutional Area, Jhalana Doongri, Jaipur.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Mohammad Hanif, Son Of Sharif Ahmed, 30 Laxmi Nagar, Opposite E.s.i. Hospital, Hatwara Road, Jaipur (Rajasthan)
2. Judge, Labour Court 1st, Jaipur

----Respondents

For Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Devansh Sharma
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Mukesh Kumar Goyal

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJEET SINGH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI CHIRANIA**

Order

23/02/2026

1. This appeal has been filed by the appellants (hereinafter to be referred to as the 'department') against the order dated 20.07.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge whereby reinstatement of the workman has been ordered.
2. In the present matter, the learned Labour Court has given a finding that the workman has not completed 240 days in a calendar year and as per the statement of claim also, the workman has worked for less than one year and despite that the



learned Single Judge has ordered for his reinstatement, which has been assailed by the department in the present appeal.

3. We have heard counsel for the parties and perused the record.
4. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Amit Kumar Dubey Vs. M.P.P.K.V.V. Co. Ltd. & Anr. reported in 2025 Supreme (online) (SC) 782 held as under:-

"1. Leave granted.

2. The instant appeals have been preferred by ten appellants separately, and thereafter tagged together, against the impugned common judgment dated 27.02.2024 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh in several connected Writ Petitions, whereby the order granting reinstatement of workmen was quashed and instead compensation of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty thousand only) was provided in lieu of reinstatement. The said Writ Petitions before the High Court were preferred by the respondent-company challenging the award(s) of the Labour Court granting similar relief of reinstatement to the appellants herein.

3. Brief facts of the matters are that the appellants were appointed on the sanctioned post of Operator TA Grade-2 in Madhya Pradesh Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Company Ltd. at different points of time pursuant to a contractual agreement obligating the appellants to serve for a period of three months. Upon successful completion of the aforesaid term, the appellants were directed to continue as a regular employee functioning as Operator TA Grade. However, in 2011, the respondent executed an agreement with the appellants so as to deprive them of the service



benefits and regularization by reflecting an artificial break or interval in the service period. Subsequently, the appellants after rendering services for different periods of time since their initial date of appointment, were terminated from their services. Such illegal termination from service was challenged by the appellants by way of separate petitions and Labour Commissioner referred the said industrial dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court, Sagar, Madhya Pradesh under Section 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

4. The Labour Court, vide different orders, granted similar relief to the appellants whose plight was based on similar factual matrix by holding their termination to be illegal as it was in contravention with Section 25F of the ID Act. It directed the respondent to reinstate the workmen-appellants and also awarded backwages to the appellants depending on the specific facts of each case.

5. Aggrieved by the award(s) of the Labour Court, the respondent preferred several Writ Petitions before the High Court challenging each of these awards in which the impugned common order was passed. The counsel for the respondent herein had confined his arguments before the High Court to the effect that even if the Labour Court had concluded that termination of service was bad on account of non-compliance of Section 25F of the ID Act, yet the direction to the respondent should have been limited to payment of compensation in lieu of reinstatement. The High Court agreed with such contention based on its reliance on several judgments of this Court on the subject matter. Accordingly, the High Court affirmed the finding with regard to setting aside of termination but so far as the order of reinstatement of workmen was concerned, the same was quashed and instead the appellants were held entitled to a compensation of



Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty thousand only) payable to each of them within a period of two months.

6. Aggrieved by the impugned order, the appellants are before us.

7. On 06.09.2024, this Court had issued notice in the matters limited to the question of quantum of compensation awarded by the High Court as it agreed with the observation of the High Court that in every case where termination is found to be illegal, the grant of reinstatement cannot be applied mechanically. Where such a termination is found illegal because of a procedural defect such as in violation of Section 25F of ID Act, this Court has consistently taken a view that in lieu of reinstatement the grant of monetary compensation shall meet the ends of justice.

8. However, we do not find the grant of a sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty thousand only) as compensation by the High Court to be adequate and just in the facts and circumstances of the present matters. The amount of sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty thousand only) is too nominal and unjust considering that the appellants were working as Operator TA Grade with the respondent. Additionally, the High Court while passing the impugned order has also lost sight of the fact that each of the appellant had served for a varying duration of time and a blanket/uniform grant of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty thousand only) as compensation in differing cases shall not meet the ends of justice and will be in contravention with the principle of proportionality.

9. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the matters, we deem it fit to enhance the compensation granted to the appellants by the High Court. We hold that the appellants would be entitled to enhanced compensation at the rate of Rs. 1.5 lakhs per year for the period they have worked and in case, they have worked for a part of



the year, then the amount of compensation is to be calculated at the same rate to be applied on a pro-rata basis. The following table represents the period of service rendered by each of the appellant and accordingly, the amount of compensation each of them shall be entitled to in terms of the above directions:

Diary No.	Appellant's Name	Month of Joining	Month of commencement of regular service	Month of termination	Period of service	Amount of compensation
34425/24	Amit Kumar Dubey	May, 2008	August, 2008	June, 2011	3 years 2 months	Rs. 4,75,000
34400/24	Anil Kumar Choudhary	June, 2009	November, 2009	March, 2011	1 year 10 months	Rs. 2,75,000
34401/24	Prakash Premi	December, 2006	March, 2007	June, 2011	4 years 7 months	Rs. 6,87,500
34420/24	Balram Ahirwar	July, 2008	October, 2008	June, 2011	3 years	Rs. 4,50,000
34720/2024	Amar Singh Thakur	July, 2008	October, 2008	June, 2011	3 years	Rs. 4,50,000
24986/2024	Devendra Kumar Shukla	January, 2004	April, 2004	July, 2011	7 years 7 months	Rs. 11,37,500
34404/2024	Abhishek Chouksey	April, 2008	July, 2008	June, 2011	3 years 3 months	Rs. 4,87,500
34419/2024	Sunil Kumar Mishra	March, 2008	May, 2008	June, 2011	3 years 4 months	Rs. 5,00,000
34412/2024	Deepchandra Rohit	April, 2008	July, 2008	June, 2011	3 years 3 months	Rs. 4,87,500
34721/2024	Nilesh Kumar	February, 2008	April, 2008	June, 2011	3 years 5 months	Rs. 5,12,500

10. Accordingly, the appeals are partly allowed to the extent of enhancement of compensation as directed above which is to be paid within three months from today. Further, any payment made to the appellant(s) under Section 17B of the ID Act shall be set off while calculating the final amount to be paid. Additionally, the respondent shall be at liberty to consider the re-engagement of the appellant(s) in view of the provisions contained in Section 25H of the ID Act.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of."



5. Since the workman has not worked only for one year with the department, therefore we deem it just and proper to grant lumpsum compensation of Rs.1,50,000/- in lieu of reinstatement.

6. In that view of the matter, the order of the learned Single Judge dated 20.07.2023 is set aside and it is directed that in lieu of reinstatement the workman shall be paid the lumpsum compensation of Rs.1,50,000/-, within two months from today.

7. The present appeal in the above terms stands disposed of. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(RAVI CHIRANIA),J

(INDERJEET SINGH),J