



\$~79

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1510/2025**
HEMANT KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Harpreet Singh Nagpal and Mr.
Gaurav Kumar, Advocates

versus

SHARP MINT INDIA PVT LTD & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

O R D E R

07.02.2025

%

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

CM APPL. 7512/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CM APPL. 7511/2025(exemption from filing of complete trial court record)

2. The petitioner is directed to place on record the complete trial court record within two weeks. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 1510/2025 & CM APPL. 7510/2025 (stay)

3. The petitioner has assailed three interlocutory orders in this petition. By way of first impugned order dated 20.07.2024, the learned Labour Court allowed the application of the petitioner workman for placing on record certain additional documents at the stage of final arguments; since the application was highly belated, the learned Labour Court imposed costs on the petitioner workman and allowed the application. By way of the second impugned order dated 30.08.2024, the learned Labour Court dismissed the



costs waiver application and on that date, authorized representative of workman submitted that costs would be paid on the next date, so the matter was adjourned. By way of the third impugned order dated 18.10.2024, the learned Labour Court dismissed the adjournment application filed by the petitioner workman, recording that prior to 18.10.2024, the petitioner workman also moved an application for waiver of the costs which was dismissed and reason advanced by the petitioner workman for adjournment was not acceptable; the reason advanced by the petitioner workman was that he wanted to challenge costs imposition order before this Court, but the exercise was under process; and since the petitioner workman did not pay the costs, opportunity to lead further evidence was closed, also keeping in mind that earlier the petitioner workman had himself closed his evidence.

4. The orders impugned in the present petition are purely procedural in nature. Not only this, as mentioned above, petitioner himself submitted before the Labour Court that costs would be paid by him but did not adhere to the undertaking. Therefore, I find no reason to invoke the writ jurisdiction in this case. The petition and the pending application stand dismissed.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

FEBRUARY 7, 2025/rk

Click here to check corrigendum, if any