



\$~37

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8213/2023**

SURENDER S/O SH LAHORI RAMPetitioner

Through: Ms. Meghna De and Ms. L. Gangmei,
Advocates.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIRespondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

% **21.05.2025**

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner seeks to assail the observation made by the Court in cross-examination dated 09.05.2023 passed by the learned Presiding Officer, Labour Court-VI in LIR No.5235/16 directing that the AR for the workman not to put questions to the witness regarding the vigilance inquiry as the witness was neither the inquiry officer of vigilance nor he was involved with the inquiry and the question was not found to be relevant to the said witness.

2. In Dena Bank v. D.V. Kundadia, reported as **(2011) 15 SCC 690**, the Supreme Court observed as under:-

2. It is well settled by this Court that no writ should be entertained against an interim order of the Labour Court or the Industrial Tribunal. It is only when a final award is given, then a party should be allowed to challenge it if he is aggrieved.

3. In the present case, the order of the Tribunal dated 28-5-1997 was only an interim order and it did not decide the



reference finally. Therefore, the writ petition was rightly dismissed. Hence, we are not inclined to interfere in this matter.

3. Though on the last date of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner sought time to obtain instructions and/or to distinguish the aforesaid decision, however, nothing has been brought on record to the contrary.

4. Considering the import of the aforesaid decision, I find no ground to entertain the present petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MAY 21, 2025/rd