



\$~1 to 3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 1579/2018 & CM APPL. 6530/2018
CM APPL. 1068/2025 & CM APPL. 20976/2025
M/S JAC AIR SERVICES PVT. LTD.

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohak Bhadana, Advocate

versus

RANBIR SINGH SEHARAWATRespondent
Through: Mr. Y.D. Sharma, Advocate

2

+ W.P.(C) 1587/2018 & CM APPL. 6539/2018
CM APPL. 41177/2022 CM APPL. 75971/2024
CM APPL. 9385/2025 CM APPL. 20977/2025
M/S JAC AIR SERVICES PVT. LTD.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Mohak Bhadana, Advocate

versus

GULSHANOWER PANWARRespondent
Through: Mr. Naman Sherstra and Mr.
Chirantan Saha, Advocates

3

+ W.P.(C) 1616/2018 & CM APPL. 6637/2018
CM APPL. 37046/2022, CM APPL. 21218/2025
M/S JAC AIR SERVICES PVT. LTD.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Mohak Bhadana, Advocate
versus

JANAK RAJRespondent
Through: Mr. Vinod Sherawat, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI
ORDER
19.01.2026

%



1. By way of present writ petitions, the petitioner/management has assailed the order dated 10.07.2017 whereby the respondents' termination from service was held to be illegal. The present petitions raise a common issue as to whether the respondent/claimants before the Tribunal were workmen within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
2. On a detailed hearing, this has come to the Court that the said issue was not even argued before the Industrial Tribunal. As common submissions have been addressed in the present petitions, they are being disposed of by a common order.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner/management contends that in their claim applications, all the 3 claimants admitted earning Rs.10000/-. Thus, they do not qualify as a workman.
4. He has also cited decisions stating that the same is a jurisdictional issue that can be urged at any stage.
5. On the other hand, counsels for the respondents contend that the appellant/management did not raise this contention before the Tribunal and as such no issues were framed on the aforesaid point. In fact, one of the counsels has further submitted that mere fact of earning more than Rs.10,000/- would not take the respondents out from the definition of workman under Section 2 of the ID Act. It is submitted that the nature of duties is interlocutory with the concept of wages.
6. Considering that neither any issue was framed nor any finding on the aspect of earning of the respondents was made, without commenting on the merits of the case, it is deemed apposite that the matter be remanded to the Tribunal for a fresh consideration. The Tribunal would examine the



aforesaid issue. The parties would be at liberty to raise all such contentions as they deem it appropriate before the Tribunal.

7. Considering that the claim applications are of the year 2012, the Tribunal is requested to dispose of the remanded matter at the earliest.

8. The matter be listed before the Tribunal at the first instance on 29.01.2026.

9. In view of the above, the above petitions alongwith the applications are disposed of.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

JANUARY 19, 2026/sn