



\$~81

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

+ **LPA 155/2026 & CM APPL. 18450-51/2026**

THE HINDUSTAN TIMES LIMITED.Appellant

Through: Mr.N.B.Joshi with Mr.Rajat Arora,
Mr.Niraj Kumar, Mr.Sourabh Mahla,
Advs.

versus

RAJESHWAR PRASAD SINGHRespondent

Through: Ms.Shrey Chathly, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **25.03.2026**

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
2. This intra-court appeal seeks exception to an order dated 02.02.2026 whereby the application made by the respondent–workman under Section 17B of the Industrial Disputes Act (hereinafter referred to as the ID Act) has been allowed and the appellant has been directed to pay last drawn pay or the minimum wages, as revised from time to time, whichever is higher, from the date of the award and continue to pay the same to the respondent–workman till the disposal of the writ petition, subject to the condition that the respondent–workman shall file an affidavit that he had not been employed and has not received any wages.
3. The sole contention of the learned counsel for the appellant is that the learned Single Judge while passing the impugned order has recorded the alleged assertion made on behalf of the appellant in the proceedings of the said application wrongly. It has been stated that learned Single Judge in



para 9 of the impugned order records that “the petitioner/management has only made a bald assertion that the respondent/workman is running an online news website”. It has been further submitted on behalf of the appellant that no such assertion in the objection filed by the appellant to the application made by the respondent under Section 17B of the ID Act was made.

4. The said factual position is being admitted by the learned counsel for the respondent.

5. What we find is that the learned Single Judge after recording the aforesaid assertion allegedly made by the appellant goes on to observe that there was no material to prove that the respondent–workman had received any remuneration out of it. Accordingly, the order appears to be based on an averment, which admittedly was never made by the appellant. Thus in the facts of the case, we set aside the order dated 02.02.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge and allow the appeal.

6. The application moved by the respondent–workman under Section 17B of the ID Act shall be decided afresh. We request the learned Single Judge to expedite the proceedings of the application and conclude the same at the earliest.

7. The appeal along with pending applications stands disposed of.

8. There shall be no orders as to costs.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

MARCH 25, 2026

S.Rawat