



\$~175

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6521/2026 & CM APPL. 32152-32154/2026**

SHIVANI SHARMA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior Advocate with Mr. Animesh Kumar, Mr. Nishant Kumar, Dr. Sumit Kumar, Ms. Aprajita, Mr. Ayush Aanand, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukul Singh, CGSC with Mr. Aryan Dhaka, Advocate for R-1. Ms. Pallavi Talwar, GP for UOI. Mr. Nikhilesh Krishnan, Mr. Siddharth Singh, Mr. Jai Pratap, Mr. Karna Mehra, Ms. Shail Saraf, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

13.05.2026

%

1. The Petitioners, stated to be working with Respondent No. 2/HLL Lifecare Ltd., a Public Sector Enterprises, are aggrieved by communications dated 28th April, 2026, whereby their engagements have been discontinued with effect from the closing hours of 13th May, 2026. By way of the present petition, the Petitioners challenge the aforesaid termination letters and seek regularisation of their services.

2. At the outset, Mr. Nikhilesh Krishnan, counsel for Respondent No. 2 raises an objection regarding the maintainability of the present petition on



the ground that Respondent No. 2 is a notified authority under the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and, therefore, amenable to the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal.¹ It is thus submitted that in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.***,² the remedy available to the Petitioners, if any, would lie before CAT.

3. In light of the foregoing, Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior Counsel for the Petitioner, seeks leave to withdraw the petition with liberty to approach the CAT.

4. At the same time, Mr. Sharawat emphasises that, as per the impugned communications, the disengagement of the Petitioners is to take effect upon the closing hours of 13th May, 2026, *i.e.*, today. It is submitted that the Petitioners were mistakenly unaware of the fact that HLL Lifecare Limited is a notified authority under the Administrative Tribunals Act and, therefore, did not approach CAT in the first instance. In these circumstances, it is prayed that *status quo* with respect to the Petitioners' engagement be maintained for a limited period to enable them to avail their remedies before CAT.

5. Mr. Krishnan, on instructions, submits that although the Petitioners have no vested right to seek continuation or extension of their engagement, nevertheless, without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the Respondents, and purely in view of the peculiar facts noted above, Respondent No. 2 is agreeable to maintain *status quo* for a period of one week from today so as to enable the Petitioners to avail their legal remedies

¹ "CAT"

² (1997) 3 SCC 261.



before the Tribunal, if so advised. Mr. Krishnan clarifies that the statement shall not be construed as any admission or concession on the merits of the Petitioners' claims. The said arrangement shall automatically lapse upon expiry of the aforesaid period. The aforesaid statement is taken on record.

6. It is however clarified that this Court has not examined the merits of the controversy. In the event the Petitioners avail their remedy before the CAT, the same shall be adjudicated independently and on its own merits, uninfluenced by the observations made herein or the statement given on behalf of Respondent No. 2 before this Court.

7. Accordingly, the present petition, along with pending application(s), is disposed of as withdrawn with liberty as aforesaid.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 13, 2026/ab