



\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 447/2017 and CM APPL. 40558/2022, CM APPL. 48209/2022, CM APPL. 48775/2023, CM APPL. 42179/2024**

Date of Decision: 23.04.2026

IN THE MATTER OF :

INDIAN NATIONAL TRADE UNION CONGRESS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjoy Ghose, Senior Advocate
with Ms. Mayuri Raghuvanshi, Mr.
Vyom Raghuvanshi, Ms. Akanksha
Rathore, Mr. Rohan Mandal and Mr.
Mohit Garg, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Pratima N Lakra CGSC with Mr
Shailendra Kumar Mishra, Ms
Upanita, Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Nishant gautam, GCSC, Mr.
Vineet Negi, Ms. Kavya Shukla, Mr.
Vibhav V. Nath, Advocates for UOI.
Mr. Neeraj Shekhar Advocate, Mrs.
Kshama Sharma Advocate, Mr.
Ritwik Prasad Advocate for R-5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)



1. The petition is for followings reliefs:
 - i) *Issue a writ(s)/order(s)/direction(s) quashing the letter dated 04.01.2017 issued by the Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India.*
 - ii) *Pass any such order or further orders that tis Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.*
2. The petitioner, Indian National Trade Union Congress (**hereinafter “INTUC”**) is a Central Trade Union registered with the Registrar of Trade Unions, Delhi under the Trade Union Act, 1926. The respondent no. 1 is Ministry of Labour and Employment. The respondent no. 2 is Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) (**hereinafter “CLC(C)”**) and respondent no. 3 is Registrar of Trade Union.
3. The petitioner - INTUC claims to be one of the major trade unions representing workmen across various sectors and has been participating in various tripartite labour bodies and consultative mechanisms constituted by the Government of India.
4. It is the case of the petitioner that INTUC has been recognized by the respondent authorities and has been invited to nominate representatives to various statutory and advisory bodies, including participation in the Indian Labour Conference, Standing Labour Conference, and other committees under labour laws.
5. It appears that pursuant to certain *inter se* disputes amongst rival factions claiming leadership of petitioner - INTUC, various civil suits and proceedings came to be instituted before competent Courts. It is, however, the case of the petitioner that notwithstanding such disputes, the respondent authorities continued to recognize and engage with the faction led by Dr. G.



Sanjeeva Reddy, including by seeking nominations and permitting participation in official deliberations up to December, 2016.

6. Subsequently, respondent no.1 – Ministry issued a letter dated 04.01.2017 (**hereinafter “impugned letter”**) whereby, petitioner was excluded from being represented in meetings convened by respondent no. 1 – Ministry and was further denied consideration for nomination to various tripartite bodies.

7. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the stand of the respondent-Ministry, as reflected in paragraph 7 of its counter- affidavit dated 10.07.2017, clearly indicates that the process of General Verification of Central Trade Union Organisations (**hereinafter “CTUOs”**) remains unaffected by the impugned letter. Paragraph no. 7 of the counter- affidavit reads as under:

7. That however, the stand of the Ministry is very clear with respect to the process of General Verification of CTUOs, which is unaffected by the above decision. The Standing Committee on general verification comprising of representative of all CTUO's and headed by CLC(C) found the claim submitted by the INTUC faction led by Dr. G. Sanjeeva Reddy prime facie is eligible for verification, while rejecting similar claims of other factions. Moreover, there is no directive from either Allahabad High Court or Delhi High Court as against the decision of the Standing Committee to restrict Sanjeeva Reddy group of INTUC.

8. A bare perusal of the paragraph no. 7 evidently indicates that the respondent - Ministry itself acknowledges that the process of General Verification of CTUOs remains unaffected by the impugned letter. It further emerges that the claim of the petitioner - INTUC faction led by Dr. G. Sanjeeva Reddy has been found *prima facie* eligible for verification by the competent Standing Committee.

9. Learned Counsel for respondent no.1 – Ministry also takes the stand



that there is no directive from either Allahabad High Court or Delhi High Court as against the decision of the Standing Committee to restrict Dr. G. Sanjeeva Reddy group of petitioner - INTUC.

10. Learned counsel appearing for the Union of India submits that certain litigations relating to internal disputes of the petitioner are pending. However, upon a query from this Court, it is conceded that no restraint order is operating in any of the said proceedings.

11. The Court thus, finds, that the basis for excluding the petitioner, as reflected in the impugned letter does not survive, particularly when (i) the verification process is stated to be unaffected, and (ii) no judicial order restraining the petitioner is in force.

12. In view of the aforementioned position, the respondent no. 1 – Ministry/concerned authority will have to review the impugned letter and to pass appropriate order in accordance with law.

13. The respondent - Union of India, however, must take the appropriate decision within eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

14. With the aforesaid directions, the petition stands disposed of.

15. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

APRIL 23, 2026/SS