



\$~4to7

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CM(M) 58/2024 & CM APPL. 1854/2024**
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sagar, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Nazia Parveen, Mr. Achyut
Dwivedi, Mr. Nitin, Mr. Krishan Pal
Chauhan, MR. Girish Garg, Mr. Sudhir
Kumar, Ms, Sonam Saini, Mr. Praveen
Kumar, Mr. Ashish Kumar, Ms. Chinky
and Ms. Anjali Dhyani, Advocates.

versus

SH. PARMOD KUMARRespondent

Through:

5

+ **CM(M) 64/2024 & CM APPL. 1916/2024**
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sagar, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Nazia Parveen, Mr. Achyut
Dwivedi, Mr. Nitin, Mr. Krishan Pal
Chauhan, MR. Girish Garg, Mr. Sudhir
Kumar, Ms, Sonam Saini, Mr. Praveen
Kumar, Mr. Ashish Kumar, Ms. Chinky
and Ms. Anjali Dhyani, Advocates.

versus

SH. BIJENDERRespondent

Through:

6

+ **CM(M) 65/2024 & CM APPL. 1919/2024**
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sagar, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Nazia Parveen, Mr. Achyut
Dwivedi, Mr. Nitin, Mr. Krishan Pal
Chauhan, MR. Girish Garg, Mr. Sudhir
Kumar, Ms, Sonam Saini, Mr. Praveen
Kumar, Mr. Ashish Kumar, Ms. Chinky
and Ms. Anjali Dhyani, Advocates.

versus

SH. VIJAYRespondent

Through:



7

+

CM(M) 70/2024 & CM APPL. 1954/2024

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sagar, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Nazia Parveen, Mr. Achyut
Dwivedi, Mr. Nitin, Mr. Krishan Pal
Chauhan, MR. Girish Garg, Mr. Sudhir
Kumar, Ms, Sonam Saini, Mr. Praveen
Kumar, Mr. Ashish Kumar, Ms. Chinky
and Ms. Anjali Dhyani, Advocates.

versus

SH. ASHOK

.....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

08.07.2024

%

1. The challenge in the present petition under Article 227 is very limited.
2. When the Presiding Officer, Labour Court-3 was seized with a petition under Section 33-C(2) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, since the concerned Deputy Commissioner had not appeared despite directions, the Court issued non-bailable warrants and also imposed cost of Rs.500/- on such Deputy Commissioner.
3. The petitioners are aggrieved by such order of issuance of coercive process and imposition of cost.
4. It has now been informed by learned counsel for the petitioners that after filing of the present petition, they had moved application before the learned Presiding Office, Labour Court and the Court has withdrawn the coercive process and even waived the cost.
5. In view of the above, nothing survives in the present petitions.
6. The petitions are dismissed as having become infructuous.

MANOJ JAIN, J

JULY 8, 2024/sw