



\$~10 to 13

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11952/2023 & CM APPL. 46818/2023**
DINESHPetitioner

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11974/2023 & CM APPL. 46946/2023**
RANBIRPetitioner

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11980/2023 & CM APPL. 46982/2023**
SANDEEP SHOKEENPetitioner

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11990/2023 & CM APPL. 47004/2023**
MANJITPetitioner

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Appearance:- Mr. Jai Prakash, Advocate for Petitioners in Item Nos. 10 to 13.
Ms. Latika Choudhury, Advocate for R-1 in Item No. 10.
Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Standing Counsel with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms. Laavanya Kaushik & Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocate in Item Nos. 10, 11 & 12.
Mr. Yeeshu Jain, Ms. Jyoti Tyagi & Ms. Priya Shukla, Advocates for R-1 in Item Nos. 10 to 13.



Mr. Gaurav Dhingra & Mr. Shashank Singh,
Advocates for R-1 & 2 in Item No. 12.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **27.05.2025**

1. The petitioners were all working at Mohalla Clinics established by Health and Family Welfare Department, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi ["GNCTD"]. They have filed these writ petitions challenging orders by which they have been de-empanelled from the services of Mohalla Clinics. They also seek release of salaries which remain unpaid for certain periods, and a direction that the embargo, which has been placed on their future empanelment, may be vacated.
2. Pursuant to order dated 23.05.2025, Mr. Jai Prakash, learned counsel for the petitioners, candidly submits that the petitioners' grievances are amenable to the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal ["CAT"], as GNCTD is a notified entity. He seeks leave to approach CAT.
3. However, Mr. Prakash submits that the petitioners would like to make a representation to GNCTD, which they may consider, in accordance with law, and that they will approach CAT thereafter, if necessary.
4. Learned counsel for GNCTD, however, submit that the action taken against the petitioners was after the report of an inquiry committee, which heard the petitioners.
5. In view of the fact that the jurisdiction for entertaining these grievances lies with CAT, I do not propose to enter into the factual



controversy on merits. Suffice it to state that if the petitioners make representations to GNCTD, they are at liberty to consider the representations with a period of four weeks thereafter.

6. If the representations are not answered or the petitioners are not satisfied with the decisions of GNCTD, they are at liberty to approach CAT on the same cause of action as ventilated in these writ petitions.

7. The writ petitions are disposed of in these terms.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 27, 2025

'pv'/AD/