



2024:DHC:3128



* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% **Date of order: 10th April, 2024**

+ **W.P.(C) 1330/2012 and CM APPL. No. 1440/2023**

MMTC LTD

..... Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Chinmoy Pradeep Sharma, Senior
Advocate with Mr.Akhil Sachar and
Ms. Sunanda Tulsyan, Advocates**

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: **Ms.Asha Jain Madan and Mr.Mukesh
Jain, Advocates for R-2 to 14, 16, 17,
19-30, 32 & 35**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA DHARI SINGH

ORDER

CHANDRA DHARI SINGH, J (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:

“(a) call for records of ID No. 1/2003 titled “Faggu Ram & others Vs. MMTC Ltd. and others” from the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi leading to making of the award dated 18th October, 2011;

(b) quash the award dated 18th October 2011 made by the Industrial Tribunal in ID no. 1/ 2003 titled “Faggu Ram & others Vs. MMTC Ltd. and others”

(c) call for records from the Labour Department, Govt. of NCT of Delhi leading to making of reference order No. F.24(2743)/2002- LAB.23591-23596 dated 2nd January 2003

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: GAURAV SHARMA
Signing Date: 23.04.2024
19:40:19

W.P.(C) 1330/2012

Page 1 of 20



Delhi;

(d) quash the reference order dated 2nd January 2003 (Annexure- P/3) mentioned in abovementioned in (b) above;
(e) pass such other and/ or further orders as deemed just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. The petitioner is a Government Company engaged in the business of import and export of minerals and metals etc. As a part of its welfare measure, the petitioner owns certain residential flats which are situated in a residential colony known as MMTC Colony and the said flats are allotted to the employees of the petitioner for their residence.

3. For the purpose of maintenance and housekeeping of the said flats as well as for ensuring regular supply of fresh water to the residents, the petitioner outsourced the work to certain agencies on contractual basis. The petitioner advertised the aforesaid work, issued tenders for the same, called for quotations, and accordingly awarded the aforesaid tenders to contractors.

4. The respondent workmen were engaged by the petitioner management/MMTC Ltd. for different posts through certain contractors working for the petitioner management.

5. A dispute arose between the parties due to demand for regularization, wherein, the appropriate government made the following reference:

“Whether a workman whose name are mentioned to Annexure ‘A’ are entitled to be regularised with the management of MMTC Ltd. From their respective dates of initial appointment and whether they are entitled to same pay and allowance in our admissible to their regular counterpart and if so, to what relief are they entitled and what directions are necessary in this respect.”



6. The respondent workmen, therefore, initiated an industrial dispute bearing ID No. 1/2003 before the learned Industrial Tribunal, seeking regularization and equalisation of wages at par with the permanent employees of the petitioner.

7. Pursuant to which, the respondent workmen filed their statement of claim and the petitioner filed its written statement. The respondent workmen thereafter filed their rejoinders.

8. Accordingly, the learned Industrial Tribunal, vide award dated 18th October, 2011, held that the contract between the petitioner company and the respondent contractors (respondent Nos. 36 and 37) is sham and camouflage, and holding the respondent workmen are employees of the petitioner . It was further held that the respondent workmen are not entitled to being regularised.

9. Aggrieved by the impugned award, the petitioner filed the instant petition.

10. Mr. Chinmoy Pradeep Sharma, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the impugned award is against the law and it suffers from illegalities and errors which are apparent on the face of the record.

11. It is submitted that the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate that the respondent workmen acknowledged their status as contractual employees and the impugned award fails to demonstrate that the learned Industrial Tribunal had accepted the respondent workmen's case.

12. It is further submitted that given their position before the learned



Industrial Tribunal, it was the responsibility of the respondent workmen to establish and demonstrate that the contractors acted as the agent of the petitioner company and that the petitioner company had granted the purported contractors authorization to engage the respondent workmen on its behalf.

13. It is submitted that the petitioner is a government-owned company, and any employee of the petitioner organization holds a public position. It is further submitted that the petitioner establishes and enforces its own set of recruitment regulations. Moreover, the petitioner is obligated to publish the job openings in addition to submitting a letter to the Employment Exchange prior to filling any vacancies.

14. It is further submitted that the respondent workmen during their cross-examination admitted that the purported vacancies had not been advertised and the names of the respondent workmen had not been transmitted to the Employment Exchange. In such a situation, it is not possible to classify the respondent workmen as employees of the petitioner.

15. It is submitted that the jurisdiction of the learned Industrial Tribunal is established by the terms of reference of the dispute that is referred to it. The terms of reference did not permit the adjudication of the question as to whether petitioner's contracts with respondent no. 36 and 37 were fraudulent. As a result, the learned Industrial Tribunal lacked the authority to adjudicate the aforementioned issue and declare the contract in question to be fraudulent and camouflage.

16. It is submitted that the learned Industrial Tribunal neglected to take



into consideration that in accordance with the legal principles established by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ram Singh & Ors. v. Union Territory, Chandigarh & Ors. 2004 SCC 1 126***, when establishing the employer-employee relationship, a number of factors must be considered. These factors include the authority to appoint and dismiss personnel, deduct insurance contributions, organize work, provide tools and materials, and establish the mutual obligations that exist between the employer and employee.

17. It is further submitted that the impugned award fails to give a finding on the aspect whether the aforementioned factors were considered during the appointment of respondent workmen. Therefore, in the absence of such a finding, the learned Industrial Tribunal erred in concluding that the contract between the petitioner and the contractor was fraudulent and consequently, classified the respondent workmen as employees of the petitioner.

18. It is submitted that the learned Industrial Tribunal failed to consider that the individuals in question were covered by the EPF & Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 and that their employer, i.e., the contractor, was depositing their contributions in accordance with the code assigned to the contractor by the EPF Organization.

19. It is submitted that the respondent workmen claim to have been hired on the instructions of one Sh. Vijay Kumar and one Sh. B.M. Gupta. However, both the aforesaid employees of the petitioner were mere Junior Engineers at the time when the respondent workmen were engaged and only Senior Managers who have been specifically delegated with the powers can



2024:DHC:3128



make recruitment decisions.

20. It is submitted that the learned Industrial Tribunal failed to appreciate the evidence adduced in the examination of Sh. Manohar Lal (MW1) who was a supervisor for a contractor M/s Uttam & Co. As per his testimony, respondent workmen namely Sh. Faggu Ram and Sh. Radhey Shyam had approached him for work and upon his recommendation to the contractor, the said workmen were hired, showing existence of supervisory and appointing functions of the contractor.

21. It is submitted that the petitioner was not obligated to utilize the staff of the departing contractor as a condition or restriction in the contract executed between the contractor and the petitioner company. They had the option to hire or not hire the employees of the departing contractors and their continued employment under the conditions did not qualify them as employees of the petitioner company. The learned Industrial Tribunal failed to take this pertinent factor into account while determining that the contract between the petitioner company and the contractors was fraudulent and illegitimate.

22. It is submitted that the learned Industrial Tribunal failed to account for the improper espousal of the industrial dispute as none of the employees of the petitioner were members of the Delhi Multistoreyed Building Employees Congress, which in itself is a general union and not the one belonging to the industry of the petitioner and its employees. Moreover, the employees of the petitioner have their own trade union, named MMTC Employees Union and neither the employees of the petitioner, nor the MMTC Employees Union



espoused the cause of the respondent workmen.

23. It is submitted that the learned Industrial Tribunal wrongly disposed of Issue Nos. 2 and 3 as not pressed by either party. The petitioner had submitted before the learned Industrial Tribunal that its activity of providing residential accommodation to its employees could not be considered an “industry” for the purposes of Section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter “the Act”).

24. It is submitted that while deciding Issue Nos. 5 and 6, the learned Industrial Tribunal failed to consider that the employment of the respondent workmen was illegal and had erred in directing the petitioner to frame a policy for regularisation of the respondent workmen.

25. It is further submitted that while deciding the aforesaid issues, the learned Industrial Tribunal failed to consider that the reference order consisted of 34 persons, but the statement of claim was filed by only 25 persons. Therefore, the persons not involved in filing the statement of claim could not be said to have any dispute and no directions could have been issued in respect thereof.

26. In light of the aforesaid submissions, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Court may grant the reliefs and the instant petition may be allowed.

27. *Per Contra*, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the instant petition is devoid of any merit and it is submitted that the impugned award has been passed as per the settled position of law and that the same does not suffer from illegality or errors apparent on the face of it.



28. It is submitted that the learned Industrial Tribunal while rendering its decision had considered all the evidence on record and the settled position of law.

29. It is submitted that the petitioner was obligated to deposit the EPF of the respondent workmen regardless of whether they were contractual employees or not. It is unlawful to deposit the EPF into the contractor's account, and the petitioner, who has been remitting the employer's portion, cannot benefit from its own wrongdoings.

30. It is submitted that the learned Industrial Tribunal has erred in denying regularisation to the respondent workmen and it should have issued directives with regard to the regularisation of the respondent workmen, including any associated benefits resulting from wage differentials, rather than merely instructing the petitioner management to develop a regularisation scheme.

31. It is submitted that terminating services of the respondent workmen during the pendency of the dispute is unlawful and the learned Industrial Tribunal was justified in directing the development of a scheme for the regularisation of employment.

32. In view of the aforesaid submissions, the learned counsel for the respondent submitted that the instant petition is devoid of any merits and the same may be dismissed by this Court.

33. Heard learned counsel for the parties as well as perused the pleadings on record.

34. It is the case of the petitioner that the respondent workmen were



engaged through contractors on work order and daily wage basis and the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate the said factum. Moreover, the petitioner asserted that even the provident fund contribution of the respondent workmen was paid by the contractors and not the petitioner themselves.

35. In rival submission, the respondent workmen submitted that they have been directly engaged by the petitioner through the agents of the petitioner masquerading as contractors. It is further submitted that the learned Industrial Tribunal has rightly held that there subsisted an employer-employee relationship between the petitioner company and the respondent workmen since, the contractors were changing but the respondent workmen were constantly working with the petitioner.

36. Before advertng to the merits of the case, this Court deems it germane to reiterate the settled principle of law pertaining to issuance of writ of certiorari.

37. A writ of certiorari may be issued only in those cases where there is an order of the lower Court which is to be quashed on the ground that there has been a wrongful exercise of powers by the lower Court/statutory authority. It can be issued if an error of law is apparent on the face of the record and in such cases, the Court has to take into account the circumstances and pass an order in equity and not as an appellate authority. The Court does not sit as an appellate authority perusing the entire record, re-appreciating the evidence, etc.

38. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking setting aside the



findings of the learned Industrial Tribunal passed *vide* the impugned award dated 18th October, 2011, therefore, before delving into the averments advanced by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties, in order to adjudicate upon the present matter, this Court deems it imperative to analyse the findings of the learned Labour Court in the impugned award dated 18th October, 2011 and reasoning afforded. The relevant paragraphs of the impugned award are reproduced herein below for reference:

“7. On the basis of pleadings of parties, following issues were framed by Ld. Predecessor on 06.09.2003:-

1. Whether the cause of workman has been duly espoused?

OPW

2. Whether management no.1 is not an industry? OPM

3. Whether this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate the present reference as per preliminary objection NO.3, taken in written statement?

OPM

4. Whether the workmen are employees of management no.1?

OPW

5. Whether the workmen shown in Annexure-A are entitled for regularisation with management NO.1?

OPW

6. As per terms of reference.

XXX

31. Findings on issue no.1

Issue no.1 is Whether the cause of workman has been duly espoused? OPW. It is the case of managements that the present case has not been properly espoused by the Union in favour of workmen. WW 6 Sh. Jagdis Prasad, General Secretary of the Worker's Union has proved on record the resolution espousing the cause of the workmen as Ex. WW 6/3

32. In J. H. Jadhav vs M/s Forbes Gotak Ltd. JT 2005 (2) SC 378 it was held by Hon'ble Supreme Court as under:

Para 3



Documents including letter written by the Union to the Dy. Labour Commissioner, as well as the objection filed by the Union before the Conciliation Officer were adduced in evidence. The tribunal came to the conclusion that in view of the evidence given by the General Secretary and the documents produced, it was clear that the appellant's cause had been espoused by the Union which was one of the Unions of the respondent employer.

Para 7

*As far as espousal is concerned there is no particular form prescribed to effect such espousal. Doubtless, the Union must normally express itself in the form of a resolution which should be proved if it is in issue. However, proof of support by the Union may also be available **aliande**.*

Para 8

The Division Bench misapplied the principles of judicial review under Article 226 in interfering with the decision. It was not a question of there being no evidence of espousal before the Industrial Tribunal. There was evidence which was considered by the Tribunal in coming to the conclusion that the appellant's cause had been espoused by the Union. The High Court should not have upset this finding without holding that the conclusion reached by the High Court is therefore unsustainable.

33. Moreover, in M/s Payen and Talbros Ltd., vs Hans Raj and others DLT 1968 Vol. IV Page 130 it was held by Hon'ble Delhi High Court that:-

that the language of section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act in itself is wide enough to cover a dispute between an employer and a single employee but having regard to the scheme of the Act and the purpose for which it was enacted and the use of the word "workmen" in this definition clause, industrial dispute has been construed by the courts to mean a collective dispute, i.e. a dispute where workmen as a body or a considerable section of them make a common cause with the



individual workman and raise a demand. It would not appear that the condition of an espousal or of a body or a considerable section of workmen making a common cause with the particular dispute arises only when individual dispute per se is of the nature of an individual dispute concerning a particular workman as opposed to collective dispute involving all the workmen. Where the dispute which was referred to the Tribunal related to gratuity scheme sought to be introduced for the benefits of all the workmen employed in a particular company, it was per se an industrial dispute. No espousal or support was needed for such a dispute.

The above judgment of Hon'ble High Court implies that espousal is not necessary in case of bulk workmen and workmen can espouse cause of each other. Therefore, even if it is presumed that there is no proper espousal in this case, the same would not affect the case of the workmen adversely. In view of above propositions of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, issue no.1 is decided in favour of workmen and against the management.

34. Findings on issue no.2 and 3.

Issue no.2 is Whether management no.1 is not an industry?

OPM.

Issue no.3 is Whether this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate the present reference as per preliminary objection No.3, taken in written statement?

OPM.

35. During the course of arguments these issues were not pressed by the parties. Therefore, issue no.2 and 3 are disposed of as not pressed.

36. Findings on issue no.4

37. Issue no.4 is Whether the workmen are employees of management no.1?

OPW

38. It is a case of management no.1 that workmen are employees of contractors and not of management no.1 i.e. MMTC Ltd. Management no.2 and 3 have also admitted the claimants to be their employees. However, it is pleaded on



*behalf of workmen that contractors used to be changed and the workmen were working already with the management even prior to engagement of contractors. Moreover, it is **admitted by MW-5, Proprietor of Anand and Co. that at the time of his contract with MMTC, claimants were already working with MMTC. It is admitted that he did not issue any appointment letter to the claimants.** Non issuance of appointment letter by contractor M/s Anand & Co. also shows that claimants were not their employees. Ex. MW 4/72 is the list of contractors showing various names of contractors mentioning the period of their contracts. This document also shows that the management no.1 kept on changing contractors and claimants were working continuously with MMTC. It is further admitted by MW- 5 that he does not have any license under the provisions of Contract Labour (Abolition and Regulation) Act.*

39. MW 6, proprietor of Contractor M/s Prominent Housekeeping in his cross-examination, has also admitted that they did not have any license under the Contract Labour Act prior to 20.6.2002. It is deposed that he did not remember if the license dated 20.6.2002 has ever been got renewed.

40. From Ex. MW 4/72 and the admissions of MW-5 and MW-6, it is clear that claimants were already and permanently working with management no.1, however, contractors kept on changing by management no.1. It is also clear from the above admissions that the contractors were not having valid license under Contract Labour (Abolition and Regulation) Act. In Secretary, Haryana State Electricity Board vs Suresh & Ors. etc. JT 1999 (2) SC 435, it was held by Hon'ble Supreme Court as under:-

However, on the facts of the present case, it was found by the Labour Court and as confirmed by the High Court that the so called contractor Kashmir Singh was a mere name lender and had procured labour for the Board from the open market. He was almost a broker or an agent of the Board for that



purpose. The labour court also noted that the Management witness Shri A.K. Chaudhary also could not tell whether Shri Kashmir Singh was a licensed contractor or not. That workmen had made a statement that Shri Kashmir Singh was not a licensed contractor. Under these circumstances, it has to be held that factually there was no genuine contract system prevailing at the relevant time wherein the Board could have acted as only the principal employer and Kashmir Singh as a licensed contractor employing labour on his own account. It is also pertinent to note that nothing was brought on record to indicate that even the Board at the relevant time, was registered as principal employer under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act. Once the Board was not a principal employer and the so called contractor Kashmir Singh was not a licensed contractor under the Act, the inevitable conclusion that had to be reached was to the effect that the so called contract system was a mere camouflage, smoke and a screen and disguised in almost a transparent veil which could easily be pierced and the real contractual relationship between the Board, on the one hand, and the employees, on the other, could be clearly visualised.

41. Therefore, keeping in view the above admissions of MWs and proposition of law cited above, in my considered opinion, the contract between management no.2 & 3 and MMTC is a sham transaction and is camouflage. Accordingly, it is held that workmen are employees of management no.1. Issue no.4 is accordingly decided in favour of workmen and against the managements.

42. Findings on issues no. 5 and 6

111. Issue no.5 is Whether the workmen shown in Annexure-A are entitled for regularisation with management NO.1? OPW



Issue no.6 is As per terms of reference. Terms of reference are "Whether workmen whose names are mentioned in Annexure A are entitled to be regularised with the management of M/s MMTC Ltd. from their respective dates of initial appointment and whether they are entitled to same pay and allowances as are admissible to their regular counter parts and if so, to what relief are they entitled and what directions are necessary in this respect?

*12. As far as claim of workmen regarding regularisation is concerned, in **Secretary, State of Karnataka vs Umadevi and others AIR 2006 SC 1806**, it was held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that:-*

"Employment of daily wager/ contractual workers confers no right of permanent employees. Secondly, it was held that contractual employee working on less wages than regular employees is also not illegal because when they are employed, they know that they were being employed as daily wager purely on temporary basis. It was also held that permanent absorption of daily wager can not be claimed as a matter of right and set of persons can not be preferred over vast majority depriving them of their opportunity to compete for public employment. It was also observed that temporary employees appointed in violation of constitutional scheme do not have an enforceable legal right to be permanently absorbed nor the court is competent to direct Government to make them permanent. It was further held that Govt. should frame one time policy for regularization of the workmen who had been working since long."

13. Though the workmen are employees of management, but in view of above judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court, they can not claim regularisation as a matter of right and, therefore,



workmen are not entitled to pay and allowances as are admissible to their regular counter parts. In this regard, management no.1, MMTC is directed to frame a policy regarding regularisation of such workmen keeping in view some reasonable criteria and consider the workmen for regularisation under that policy. This issue is decided accordingly.

20. Award is passed in the above terms. Copy of the award be sent to GNCT of Delhi for publication. File be consigned to record room.”

39. In the impugned award, the learned Industrial Tribunal framed 6 issues for adjudication. Issue No. 1 was whether the cause of the workmen has been duly espoused. In this regard, the petitioner management contended that the present case is not properly espoused by the Union in favour of the respondent workmen.

40. In the light of the averments made by the petitioner management, the learned Industrial Tribunal held that espousal is not necessary in cases of multiple workmen and the workmen can espouse cause for each other. Accordingly, the learned Industrial Tribunal held that no proper espousal of the case would not adversely affect the respondent workmen and ruled the issue no.1 in favour of the respondent workmen.

41. Issue Nos. 2 and 3 were not pressed during the arguments by the parties. Therefore, the Tribunal did not make any observations with regard to the same.

42. Now adverting to issue No. 4, i.e., whether the respondent workmen are employees of the petitioner. *Qua* the said issue, it is the case of the



petitioner that the respondent workmen are employees of the contractors and not the petitioner, and in response to the same, the respondent workmen submitted that they were working with the petitioner prior to the engagement of the contractors and it has been admitted by MW-5, i.e., proprietor of M/s Anand and Co., that the respondent workmen were already working with the petitioner at the time of his contract with the petitioner. He further admitted that he did not issue appointment letters to the respondent workmen and that he did not have any license as per the provisions of the Contract Labour (Abolition and Regulation) Act, 1970.

43. In light of the aforesaid discussions, the learned Tribunal held that the non-issuance of appointment letters by the contractor namely M/s Anand and Co. demonstrates the fact that the respondent workmen are not employees of the petitioner. Moreover, as per Ex. MW4/72 which is the list of the contractors along with the period of contract, the learned Tribunal in this regard opined that from the perusal of the said document, it was clearly evident that the respondent workmen were working continuously with the petitioner and the contractors kept on changing.

44. The proprietor of the contractor M/s Prominent Housekeeping, i.e., MW 6, during his cross-examination also admitted the fact that he didn't have any license as mandated under the Contract Labour (Abolition and Regulation) Act, 1970 before 20th June 2002 and that he did not remember whether the license granted on 20th June 2002 was ever renewed.

45. In view of the aforesaid discussions, the learned Tribunal held that the contractors kept on changing, however, the respondent workmen were



permanently working with the petitioner. Moreover, the contractors had no license as mandated under the Contract Labour (Abolition and Regulation) Act, 1970. It further placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Secretary, Haryana State Electricity Board vs Suresh & Ors. etc. JT 1999 (2) SC 435* wherein a factual situation similar to the instant petition arose and the Hon'ble Court held that there is a contractual relationship between the organisation and the employee.

46. Accordingly, it was held that the contract between the contractors and the petitioner is a camouflage and the respondent workmen are employees of the petitioner. Hence, the learned Tribunal decided the issue no. 4 in favour of the respondent workmen and against the petitioner.

47. Issue no. 5 which pertained to whether the workmen whose names are there in Annexure- A were entitled for regularisation and issue no. 6 was regarding whether the aforesaid workers were entitled for regularisation from the date of their initial appointment and whether they were entitled to the pay and allowances at par with their regular counterparts.

48. The learned Tribunal while taking into consideration the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Secretary, State of Karnataka vs Umadevi and others, AIR 2006 SC 1806* held that the respondent workmen could not claim regularisation as a right and therefore, they were not entitled to pay and allowances as payable to their regular counterparts. Learned Tribunal further directed the petitioner to frame a policy for regularisation of workmen like the respondent workmen by making a reasonable criterion for regularisation and to consider the respondent workmen for regularisation



under the said policy.

49. Accordingly, the respondent workmen were not granted regularisation.

50. With regard to the issues at hand, the learned Tribunal has correctly held that the respondent workmen are the employees of the petitioner on the ground that the contractors are not issuing any appointment letters to the respondent workmen and the contractors are changing, however, the respondent workmen are working permanently with the petitioner. Furthermore, the contractor does not have requisite license as per the Contract Labour (Abolition and Regulation) Act, 1970.

51. Furthermore, the learned Tribunal has correctly placed reliance on the judgment of *Secretary, Haryana State Electricity Board (Supra)*, wherein, it was held that in a situation where the contractors are changing, however, the workmen are working permanently with an organisation, then the Court shall pierce the veil and hold that the workmen are employees of the organisation itself.

52. In light of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the view that since as per the evidence on record, the workmen were continuously employed by the respondent management despite changes in the contractors, the learned Tribunal has correctly held that there is a relationship of employer and employee between the petitioner and the respondent workmen.

53. In view of the foregoing discussions, this Court does not find any error apparent on the face of the record and therefore, the impugned award dated 18th October 2011 in ID no. 1/2003 passed by the learned Industrial



2024:DHC:3128



Tribunal does not suffer from any illegality and the same is hereby upheld.

54. Accordingly, the instant petition alongwith the pending applications, if any, stands dismissed.

55. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

CHANDRA DHARI SINGH, J

APRIL 10, 2024

SV/DB/RYP

Click here to check corrigendum, if any

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: GAURAV SHARMA
Signing Date: 23.04.2024
19:40:19

W.P.(C) 1330/2012

Page 20 of 20