



2026:DHC:6932



\$~26

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% ***Date of Decision: 19th August, 2026***# **CNR No. DLHC015649582015**+ **W.P.(C) 10698/2015****SHANTI DEVI & ANR**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, Ms. Bhumica Kundra, Mr. Shubham Bahl, Mr. Nikhil Pawar, Ms. Tanya Rose, Ms. Kritika Matta, Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Ms. Anjali Bansal, Mr. Lovekesh Chauhan, Mr. Manas Verma & Mr. Shakib Malik, Advs.

versus

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Vijay Joshi, CGSC with Ms. Katyayani Joshi, Adv.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN****J U D G M E N T (O R A L)****AMIT MAHAJAN, J.**

1. The present petition is filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India assailing award dated 04.03.2014 (hereinafter '*impugned award*' passed by the learned Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal in I.D. No. 45/2000 whereby the learned Tribunal granted ₹50,000 as compensation to each of the petitioners, in lieu of reinstatement.
2. The petitioners are essentially aggrieved that the amount of compensation granted by the learned Tribunal is insufficient.
3. It is pertinent to note that the award passed by the learned

Signature Not Verified

Signed By: SANJAY
KUMAR
Signing Date: 19.08.2026
20:02:14



2026:DHC:6932



Tribunal has been accepted by the respondent department, therefore, it remains undisputed that the petitioners were working as daily wagers, for the respondent, between the years 1983 and 1997, equating to a period of more than 14 years, before being terminated.

4. The learned Tribunal held that the management, without any fault of the petitioners, illegally terminated their services, only on verbal notice. Thus, the learned Tribunal granted a compensation of ₹50,000/- to each of the Petitioners.

5. In the opinion of this Court, the said amount of compensation is not adequate. At the same time, it is relevant to note that the claim against the illegal termination was raised belatedly by the petitioners, after more than 17 months of their termination, on 31.05.1999. Further, the petitioners approached this Court after more than one and a half years of passing of the impugned award.

6. Thus, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, in the opinion of this Court, the ends of justice would be served if the compensation amount is enhanced to ₹2,00,000/-, to each of the Petitioners.

7. The amount of ₹2,00,000/-, however, shall not contain any interest and shall be paid by the respondent within a period of eight weeks.

8. The present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms and the impugned award is modified to that extent.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 19, 2026

“SS”