

\$~32

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 10376/2016 & C.M. No.40793/2016**
JOGINDER SINGH WADHWA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Manoj Ohri, Sr. Adv with Mr. B.P. Singh, Adv,

versus

EAST DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Amrta Pal Singh, Adv

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **04.11.2016**

The petitioner is aggrieved by an inaction on the part of respondent No. 1/East Delhi Municipal Corporation. Two contracts/work orders had been issued by respondent No. 1 in favour of the petitioner dated 25.10.2012 & 30.10.2012 respectively. His submission is that these work orders are in contradiction to the work order issued by the other Corporation including the one issued by the South Delhi Municipal Corporation. Although admittedly he is making the payment at minimum wages rate of the Beldar which in his work orders has been fixed at Rs.297/- per day (he is admittedly getting escalated rate). His grievance is that the foul condition which was in the work order of the South Delhi Municipal Corporation has not been incorporated in the work orders issued to him by East Delhi Municipal Corporation. In fact this is his grievance. He has also made a representation dated 24.09.2016 to the Department. Copy of that

representation is with the respondent. There is no dispute to this. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that this representation has admittedly been given recently. Submission of the respondent is that he will answer this representation in accordance with law.

In view of this stand taken by the respondent, no further orders are called for on this petition. The representation of the petitioner dated 24.09.2016 will be answered by the respondent in accordance with law within an outer limit of six weeks from today. Needless to state that the petitioner may approach this Court, in case he is not satisfied with the answer on his representation.

Petition disposed of.

Order dasti.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

NOVEMBER 04, 2016

A