



\$~9

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% **Date of decision: April 28, 2022**

+ LPA 252/2022 & CM APPL. 17497/2022

BABU RAM SAGAR

..... Appellant

Through: Mr. Sarvesh Singh, Mr. Sanjay Premi
and Mr. Parmod Kr. Jain, Advocates.

versus

LT. GOVERNOR OF NCT OF
DELHI AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Lalitaksh Joshi, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESH KUMAR KAIT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR KUMAR JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. The present appeal has been filed by the appellant under Clause 10 Letter Patent Appeal challenging the Impugned Judgment and Order dated 26.10.2021 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Hon'ble Court in W.P.(C) No. 12070/2021.
2. The present case has arisen that appellant was terminated from the service in the year 1991. Thereafter, he approached the Labour Court and *vide* order dated 29.08.1992, the Labour Court had granted Rs.40,000/- compensation to be paid in the name of the appellant herein, and the same has been paid by the respondent and accepted by the appellant.
3. After four years, the appellant had filed W.P.(C) 865/1996 for reinstatement in the services, which was dismissed *vide* order dated 05.07.2006.
4. Being aggrieved, the appellant filed LPA 2067/2006 and the same

LPA 252/2022

Page 1 of 2



was also dismissed *vide* order dated 03.02.2009.

5. Since the learned Labour Court passed the order and granted compensation of Rs. 40,000/-, which was accepted by the appellant, the matter ends at that very stage. However, he continued to file the writ petition and LPA as mentioned above, which were dismissed, then there was no occasion to file subsequent petition i.e., W.P.(C) 1264/2019, based upon the Annexure-E, which is mentioned in the order dated 01.05.2019 passed by this Court. However, the respondents were directed to dispose of the representation dated 20.06.2018 and the same was dismissed *vide* order dated 18.08.2021.

6. Upon perusal of the order passed by the learned Labour Court and this Court and the fact that the appellant was terminated in the year 1991 and thereafter, he accepted the compensation amount of Rs.40,000/- and his last representation, which was made in the year 2018, had also been dismissed, we find no ground to interfere with the decision taken by the respondents.

7. We find no merit in the present appeal. Hence, the same is dismissed accordingly.

SURESH KUMAR KAIT, J

SUDHIR KUMAR JAIN, J

APRIL 28, 2022/N