



\$~30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6962/2025 & CM APPL. 31489/2025**

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIPetitioner

Through: Ms. Divya Swamy, Mr. Rishav
Ranjan and Ms. Akriti Singh,
Advs.

versus

RAVINDER KAUSHIK AND OTHERSRespondents

Through: Mr. Nishant Awana and
Ms. Rini Badoni, Advs for R1 to
R11.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

%

26.11.2025

1. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 28.11.2023 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 857/2018, titled ***Sh. Ravinder Kaushik & Ors. v. Secretary, Urban Development & Director of Local Bodies & Anr.***, allowing the said O.A. filed by the respondents herein, with the following directions:

"7. In the light of what has been discussed and detailed above, the present OA is allowed and the impugned order dated 14.12.2017 is quashed and set aside. The competent authority amongst the respondents is directed to revise the pay and allowances of the applicants strictly on parity with the employees holding identical post on regular basis. Thereafter, future increments and



revision of pay and allowances shall also be made on the same analogy and on parity with the employees holding that post on regular basis.

8. Although the relief of regularisation has not been specifically asked for, we find that continuing an employee on contract continuously for a period of 13 long years is not a happy situation. Once the benefit of salary and allowances at par with regular employees has been extended, the competent authority amongst the respondents should also take an appropriate decision with respect to the terms and conditions of appointment of these employees in future.

9. The applicants shall be entitled to the revised salary and allowances in terms of this order w.e.f. the date which is 2 years preceding the date of this order i.e. 29.11.2021. However, notional benefit of this revised pay and allowances shall be extended in their favour w.e.f. the date of their initial appointment/engagement. While revised pay and allowances shall be released to them w.e.f. the next date when salary shall be paid to them, the arrears for the last two years shall be extended in their favour in instalments in such a manner as to clear all these arrears within a period of one year from the date of this order.”

2. The learned counsel for the respondents submits that the respondents shall not claim any relief on the basis of the Impugned Order, as the same relief has been granted to the respondents by the learned Industrial Tribunal, which is pending adjudication before the Supreme Court in SLP (C) No.4966/2025, titled ***Municipal Corporation of Delhi v. Manish Kumar & Ors.***

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner, on the other hand,



submits that the respondents are guilty of forum shopping and, therefore, even otherwise, are not entitled to any relief, whether from the learned Tribunal or from the learned Labour Court.

4. Without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the petitioner, and in view of the submission made by the learned counsel for the respondents that the respondents will not be claiming any benefit under the Impugned Order of the learned Tribunal, nothing further survives for adjudication in the present petition, except stating that the Impugned Order shall not be enforced nor be treated as a precedent by the learned Tribunal.

5. The petition, along with the pending application, is disposed of in the above terms.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

NOVEMBER 26, 2025/b/P/SJ