



\$~74

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1346/2026 and CM APPL.6690/2026**

JAIN COOPERATIVE BANK LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhinav Sharma and Mr. Shreesh Pathak, Advs. along with Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Legal Officer.

versus

RAJEEV JAIN

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **03.02.2026**

CM APPLs.6691/2026, 6692/2026, 6694/2026 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 1346/2026 and CM APPLs.6690/2026, 6693/2026

3. The present petition assails orders dated 17.11.2025 and 17.01.2026, passed by the learned Presiding Officer, Labour Court-X, Rouse Avenue Courts, New Delhi in LID NO.40/2024 (earlier LC No.774/2018).
4. Essentially, the petitioner is aggrieved by the imposition of costs *vide* the said order. The circumstances which impelled the concerned court to impose costs have been set out in the aforementioned orders dated 17.11.2025 and 17.01.2026. The said orders, respectively, read as under:



**L I D 40-24 RAJEEV JAIN Vs. M/S JAIN COOPERATIVE BANK LTD
AND ORS**

17.01.2026

Present: Sh. Rajeev Jain, Workman in person.
Ms. Gurjoot Sethi, proxy for Sh. Abhinav Sharma, AR for the Management.

Reply to the two applications of the management filed. Copy Supplied.

It is stated by proxy AR for the management that main AR will be available by 11:30 AM. Be awaited.

(Arun Goel)
District Judge
Presiding Officer Labour Court- X
Rouse Avenue Courts-New Delhi:17.01.2026

At 11:30 AM

Present: Sh. Rajeev Jain, Workman in person.
Ms. Gurjoot Sethi, proxy for Sh. Abhinav Sharma, AR for the Management.

It is stated by proxy AR for the management that main AR will be available shortly. Be awaited.

(Arun Goel)
District Judge
Presiding Officer Labour Court- X
Rouse Avenue Courts-New Delhi:17.01.2026

Present: Sh. Rajeev Jain, Workman in person.
Sh. Abhinav Sharma, AR for the Management.

In the present case, two applications were filed on behalf of the management one was for bringing on record certain documents. Arguments on the said application heard.

During arguments, it is stated by AR for the workman that he has no objection if the said documents are taken on record.

In the present matter the enquiry issue was decided in favour of the workman vide order dated 10.09.2025 thereafter, the management was granted opportunity to lead evidence. It is stated by AR for the management that documents are necessary to prove the charges against the workman. In view of the no objection given by the workman the application is allowed and the management is allowed to file additional documents as mentioned in their application on record.



The another application has been filed on behalf of the management for waiver of cost imposed vide order dated 17.11.2025.

Heard.

In the present matter, the management has been granted opportunity to lead evidence two times despite that they have not lead any evidence. Accordingly, the application for waiver of cost stands dismissed and cost be paid on the next date of hearing.

It is further stated by AR for the management that they have already moved an application for transfer of the present case and request for adjournment.

Heard. This is not a ground for adjournment.

Let the examination in chief be conducted.

While exhibiting the document in the examination in chief, it has been pointed out that the witness has not brought the original of the documents which the management has sought to produce on record. The management was aware that the matter is listed for evidence and the witness should have brought the originals of the document filed on record.

In the present matter, the matter is listed for management evidence since 10.09.2025, despite that the management has not started their evidence yet. Today, the witness has not brought the originals and the matter has been passover since morning.

It is also relevant herein to mention that the management has filed an application for filing additional documents on record. The rest of the document which is relevant for evidence are already on record. Only the document that is the application regarding which was filed on behalf of the management to brought on record the original of same has not been brought today by the witness.

The matter is listed for management evidence as well as for consideration of application filed by the management. In that case an application regarding bringing the documents on record was pending and it was essential for the management to brought the original of the same with them in case the court wanted to go through them before allowing their application.

It appears that the management is deliberately trying to delay the matter and is keen on for taking adjournment. However, keeping in view the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to the management to lead their evidence subject to further cost of Rs.30,000/- imposed upon the management out of which Rs.15,000/- to be deposited in the DLSA and Rs.15,000/- to be paid to the workman as well as for

payment of previous cost of Rs.10,000/- on the next date of hearing i.e., 09.02.2026 @11 :00 AM.

(Arun Goel)
District Judge
Presiding Officer Labour Court- X
Rouse Avenue Courts-New Delhi: 17.01.2026



And

48 L I D 40-24 RAJEEV JAIN Vs. M/S JAIN COOPERATIVE BANK
LTD AND ORS

17.11.2025

Present: Workman in person.
Sh. Shreesh Pathak, AR for the Management.

Amended memo of parties filed in compliance of order dated
31.10.2025.

An application has been filed on behalf of the management stating that some more time is required for placing on record order passed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court dated 11.11.2025, however it is further submitted that more time is required for leading the evidence on behalf of the management.

Perusal of the order passed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court reveals that there is no stay granted in the present matter. In the present matter the preliminary issues were decided vide order dated 10.09.2025 and since then two dates have been elapsed, despite that the management has failed to lead their evidence and today also management is asking for some more time to lead their evidence.

Accordingly, in the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is given to the management to lead their evidence subject to cost of Rs.10,000/- to be paid to the workman on the next date of hearing.

Management is directed to supply the advance copy of the affidavit of evidence to the opposite party atleast one week in advance before the next date of hearing i.e., 06.12.2025.

(Arun Goel)
District Judge
Presiding Officer Labour Court- X
Rouse Avenue Courts-New Delhi:17.11.2025

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to present his own version of events seeking to bring out that the imposition of costs is unjustified. However, in these proceedings, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the discretion exercised by the concerned Labour Court.
6. It is also noticed that the costs imposed are not exorbitant and are quite nominal in nature.
7. In the circumstances, this Court finds no occasion to interfere with the impugned orders.
8. The present petition is accordingly, dismissed.



9. It is clarified that the imposition of costs shall not be construed as a reflection on the counsel for the petitioner.

SACHIN DATTA, J

FEBRUARY 3, 2026/cl