



\$~58

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10530/2023**

ATTAR SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Avinash Gaur, Advocate.**

versus

BIRD AIRPORT HOTEL PVT LTD AND ANR.Respondents

Through: **Mr. Virender Mehta and Mr. Abhishek Mohan, Advocates.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **11.07.2025**

CM APPL. 40430/2025 (for early hearing)

1. This is an application filed by the petitioner for early hearing of the writ petition.
2. With the consent of learned counsel for the respondents, the application is allowed, and the writ petition is taken on Board.
3. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 10530/2023

4. The present writ petition has been filed against two respondents, being respondent No. 1 - Chief Executive Officer, Bird Airport Hotel Pvt. Ltd., and respondent No. 2 - General Manager, Roseate House, New Delhi.
5. The reliefs sought are directed against a termination letter dated 02.06.2023, by which the respondents have terminated the petitioner's services as Director of Engineering, and a direction for adjudication of



allegation levelled against the petitioner by way of an impartial inquiry. The petitioner also seeks reinstatement in service. An alternative prayer has also been made for releasing the petitioner's two months' salary, as well as consequential benefits thereof .

6. A preliminary objection is taken by the respondents to the effect that the writ petition is not maintainable, as it concerns service dispute of a purely private and contractual nature.

7. It is not disputed that the respondents are private entities. The business of the respondents is running a private hotel. There is no suggestion in the writ petition with regard to discharge of any public function, which attracts the jurisdiction of the constitutional Court under Article 226 of the Constitution. Reference in this context is made to the recent judgments of the Supreme Court in *S. Shobha vs. Muthoot Finance Ltd* [2025 SCC OnLine SC 177] and *R.S. Madireddy v. Union of India* [2024 SCC OnLine SC 965].

8. Consequently, the writ petition is dismissed, with liberty to the petitioner to take any alternative remedy, as may be available to him in law.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 11, 2025
UK/AD/