



\$~42

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7307/2022 & CM APPL. 11042/2025**

SURESH KUMAR RANGA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kanishk Ahuja, Advocate.

versus

CONTAINER CORPORATION OF INDIA & ANR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. B.S Rana, Advocate for R-1.
Mr. Abhishek Saket, SPCG for R-2
with Mr. Manish Madhukar, Ms.
Aparna, Mr. Abhigyan. Ms. Reya
Paul, Advocates for Respondent 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

23.01.2026

1. The Petitioner was dismissed from service on 23rd November, 1998 by Respondent No. 1, Container Corporation of India. Though the dismissal was assailed by the Petitioner, the proceedings initiated in that regard were subsequently withdrawn.
2. Thereafter, in the year 2006, the Petitioner filed an application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 before the Regional Labour Commissioner. However, the said proceedings were also not pursued and were ultimately not pressed.
3. The Petitioner thereafter approached the National Commission for



Scheduled Castes¹ in the year 2006, which culminated in recommendations issued in June, 2009. Relying upon the said recommendations, the Petitioner has filed the present writ petition seeking, inter alia, the following reliefs:

“Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondents to implement the findings of the National Commission for Scheduled Castes dated June 2009, including reinstating the Petitioner with full back wages and other attending/consequential benefits;

ii. In the alternative, direct the Respondent No. 1 Container Corporation of India to pass a written speaking order (with reasons) deciding the Petitioner’s review dated 12.5.2012 after taking into consideration the findings dated June 2009 of the Hon’ble National Commission for Scheduled Castes and after providing the Petitioner with a proper opportunity of being heard and/or

iii. Pass any such order(s) as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit in the interest of justice, equity and good conscience.”

4. In the opinion of the Court, the present writ petition is grossly misconceived and amounts to an abuse of the process of law. It is a settled position that the NCSC does not exercise adjudicatory jurisdiction over service disputes, nor can its recommendations be treated as enforceable directions requiring reinstatement and back wages in service matters.² Accordingly, the Petitioner cannot, on the strength of such recommendations, seek a writ of mandamus directing Respondent No. 1 to reinstate him with consequential benefits. The relief sought, based on recommendations of the Commission, which are not enforceable in law, cannot be granted in writ proceedings.

5. The alternative prayer seeking a direction to the Respondent to decide the Petitioner’s review dated 12th May, 2012 is also untenable. The Petitioner, having failed to pursue remedies against the dismissal order dated

¹ “NCSC”

² *All India Indian Overseas Bank SC & ST Employees Welfare Association & Ors. v. UOI & Ors.* (1996)



23rd November, 1998, cannot, after such delay and abandonment of earlier proceedings, seek a writ of mandamus to revive the matter by relying upon the recommendations of the NCSC.

6. In view of the above, the present writ petition is dismissed along with pending application(s), if any.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JANUARY 23, 2026/ab

6 SCC 606; *Collector v. Ajit Jogi* (2011) 10 SCC 357.