



\$~59

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 4562/2025**

SATENDER KUMAR SHRIVASTVA & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Onkar Roy, Mr. S.K. Alok and
Mr. Armaan Rataeeya, Advocates.

versus

REGISTRAR CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj, Ms. Priyanka
Bhardwaj and Mr. Praveen Kaushik,
Advocates for Society.
Mr. Sameer Vashisht, Standing
Counsel (Civil) GNCTD with Mr.
Manashwy Jha and Ms. Harshita
Nathrani, Advocates for R-1/RCS
(GNCTD).
Mr. Vikas Kr. Sharma, Sr. Panel
Counsel for UOI/ R-5.

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA

ORDER
09.04.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CM APPL. 21109/2025 (for exemption)

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4562/2025 & CM APPLs. 21108/2025 (for reinstating from termination of the Petitioners)

3. The present petition has been filed by the Petitioner – Satender Kumar Shrivastava under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India *inter alia* seeking a direction to the Respondent No.2- CGS Cooperative Land and



Group Housing Society (hereinafter '*Society*') to pay minimum wages to the Petitioners for their respective jobs.

4. The Petitioners are blue collar workers in the said Society. They claim to be working as Plumbers, Accounts Clerks, Peons, Stenographers etc., in the Society.

5. Their grievance is two-fold. First, that one of the workers has been removed and has not been re-instated and, secondly that even the minimum wages is not being paid by the Society to the other employees.

6. Ld. Counsel for the Society has pointed out that this is the second writ petition being filed by the Petitioners. In the earlier round i.e., ***W.P.(C) 6218/2023***, the entire matter was considered by the Court and was disposed of *vide* order dated 6th March, 2025 with liberty to the Petitioners to avail of their remedies in accordance with law. The operative portion of the said order reads as under :-

“13. In view of the above, no further directions are required to be issued in the present petition. The same is accordingly disposed of.

14. However, we clarify that if respondent No.2/Society has violated any of the applicable statutes regarding provisions of perquisites or emoluments, this order will not preclude the petitioners from availing specific remedies as available in the said enactments.”

7. The Court has heard the parties and considered the matter. Considering that the same issues are sought to be re-agitated in the present petition, the same cannot be permitted.

8. At this stage, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition with liberty to avail of remedies in accordance with law.



9. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as aforesaid. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J

RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA, J

APRIL 9, 2025/nd/Ar.