



\$~62

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 18432/2025, CM APPL. 76307/2025 & CM APPL.
76308/2025

MANOJ KUMAR SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth, Adv.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI (GNCTD)Respondent

Through: Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, Standing
Counsel with Mr. Nitesh Kumar
Singh, Ms. Aliza Alam and Mr.
Mohnish Sehrawat, Advs. for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

ORDER
04.12.2025

%

1. This petition is filed seeking quashing of communication dated 01.08.2025 written by respondent no.1/Govt. of NCT of Delhi (GNCTD) to respondent no. 2/Intelligent Communication Systems India Ltd. (in short 'ICSIL').
2. The brief facts are that the petitioner was appointed as Senior Project Associate (Wildlife) on contractual basis in Department of Forest and Wildlife GNCT of Delhi. The appointment letter was issued by ICSIL. The contract period of the petitioner was from 28.01.2025 to 27.01.2026 as per office order dated 20.02.2025 annexed with the petition.
3. The grievance is against the communication dated 01.08.2025 whereby respondent no.1 informed ICSIL that the services of the petitioner



were not required.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the contract period of the petitioner was till 27.01.2026 and there is no reason given for terminating the service.

5. Learned counsel for respondent no. 1 on advance notice submits that the petitioner was not an employee of respondent no. 1. He was engaged through ICSIL and the contract was between respondent no. 1 and ICSIL. With the change in circumstances, the services were not required, the ICSIL was accordingly informed.

6. On a pin-pointed query by the court to show any document that there was an employer-employee relationship between the petitioner and respondent no.1, nothing has been produced.

7. The grievance of the petitioner, if any, is against respondent no. 2, a private entity (limited company) and it is not a case set up that respondent no. 2 is a 'State' under Article 12 of the Constitution of India.

8. In view of above, no case is made out for interference in the writ jurisdiction.

9. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J

DECEMBER 4, 2025/Pa