



\$~19 to 23

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

19

+ CM(M) 3696/2024
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIPetitioner
Through: Ms. Tajinder Virdi, Standing Counsel,
MCD
versus
RAJERespondent
Through: None.

20

+ CM(M) 3723/2024
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIPetitioner
Through: Ms. Tajinder Virdi, Standing Counsel,
MCD
versus
ASHOKRespondent
Through: None.

21

+ CM(M) 3725/2024
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIPetitioner
Through: Ms. Tajinder Virdi, Standing Counsel,
MCD
versus
OM VEERRespondent
Through: None.

22

+ CM(M) 3727/2024
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIPetitioner
Through: Ms. Tajinder Virdi, Standing Counsel,
MCD
versus
RAJANRespondent
Through: None.

23

+ CM(M) 3751/2024
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIPetitioner



Through: Ms. Tajinder Viridi, Standing Counsel,
MCD

versus

SHILA

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

28.05.2025

%

CM APPL.33665/2025 (exemption) in CM(M) 3696/2024

CM APPL.33668/2025 (exemption) in CM(M) 3723/2024

CM APPL.33672/2025 (exemption) in CM(M) 3725/2024

CM APPL.33681/2025 (exemption) in CM(M) 3727/2024

CM APPL.33687/2025 (exemption) in CM(M) 3751/2024

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

CM APPL.33664/2025 (modification of order dated 17.04.2025) in

CM(M) 3696/2024, CM APPL.33667/2025 (modification of order

dated 17.04.2025) in CM(M) 3723/2024, CM APPL.33671/2025

(modification of order dated 17.04.2025) in CM(M) 3725/2024

CM APPL.33680/2025 (modification of order dated 17.04.2025)in

CM(M) 3727/2024, CM APPL.33686/2025 (modification of order

dated 17.04.2025)in CM(M) 3751/2024

1. Petitioner seeks modification of order dated 17.04.2025.
2. It was a common order passed in 32 connected matters.
3. It has now been prayed that the cost may be waived off in its entirety and the grievance of the petitioner with respect to duplicity and multiplicity of similar claims lodged by the workmen may be left open.
4. Having gone through the abovesaid order, there is no requirement of modifying the order as the order is already amply clear.
5. At the cost of repetition, it is clarified that the Court had only



gone through the aspect of cost being little excessive and exorbitant and beyond that there is no other right of either of the parties which has been decided by this Court.

6. There is no reason to waive off the cost in its entirety. It is noticed that the cost imposed by the learned Presiding Officer, Labour Court was Rs.20,000/-, which was rather reduced to Rs.1,000/- in each case.

7. Since the cost has not been deposited so far, the time for depositing cost is, however, extended by a period of ten days to be reckoned from today.

8. The applications are disposed of in aforesaid terms.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MAY 28, 2025
st/SS