



\$~71

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3125/2026 & CM APPL. 15076-15077/2026**

DR. SATYAPAL SINGH CHOUDHARY AND ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Aruni Poddar, Ms. Shivani
Poddar and Mr. Anit Kumar,
Advocate.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Dr. Divya Swamy, SC, MCD with
Ms. Yagyawalkya Singh and Mr.
Shikhar Rusia, Advocates for MCD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

12.03.2026

1. This petition seeks a *mandamus*, directing the Respondents to regularise the services of the Petitioners, who have been working as Ayurvedic Medical Officers on contractual basis with the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“MCD”).
2. At the outset, counsel for the Respondents raises a preliminary objection as to the maintainability of the present petition. It is submitted that the dispute raised in the petition pertains to service conditions and regularisation of employees working under the MCD and, therefore, falls within the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal (“CAT”). It is contended that the Petitioners cannot bypass the statutory forum and directly



invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

3. Mr. Aruni Poddar, counsel for the Petitioner, submits that the Petitioners have been serving on contractual basis for more than two decades and their case for regularisation deserves consideration in light of the legal principles governing regularisation of employees who have rendered long and uninterrupted service. She further submits that the Petitioners were appointed pursuant to a duly notified advertisement and through a selection process, and therefore seek appropriate directions from this Court for regularisation of their services.

4. In the opinion of the Court, the dispute raised in the present petition essentially pertains to service matters relating to employees working under a municipal authority. In view of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.***,¹ matters falling within the scope of service jurisprudence involving authorities amenable to the jurisdiction of the CAT are required to be first adjudicated by the Tribunal.

5. In that view of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that the Petitioners ought to avail of the remedy before the CAT in the first instance. The Tribunal would be the appropriate forum to examine the factual and legal issues raised in the present petition, including the Petitioners' claim for regularisation.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as not maintainable, with liberty to the Petitioners to approach the CAT in accordance with law.

7. It is clarified that this Court has not examined the merits of the claims raised in the present petition. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open to be urged before the Tribunal.



8. The petition is disposed of in the above terms, along with the pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 12, 2026/hc

¹ (1997) 3 SCC 261.