



\$~51

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

+ W.P.(C) 16382/2022, CM APPL. 51455/2022,
CM APPL. 51456/2022 and CM APPL. 57439/2023

ANURAG AHUJA AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Ms.Meghna De and Mr.Siddharth Sapra,
Advocates

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Avnish Ahlawat Standing Counsel
GNCTD

Mr.Shivnath Kumar, Advocate for respondent
No.2

Mr.Rishabh Sahu, SPC with Mr.Sameer Sharma,
Advocates for UOI

53

+ W.P.(C) 16477/2022, CM APPL. 51741/2022 and
CM APPL. 53850/2023

SH SUSHIL KUMAR AND ANRPetitioners

Through: Ms.Meghna De and Mr.Siddharth Sapra,
Advocates

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Avnish Ahlawat Standing Counsel
GNCTD

Mr.Shivnath Kumar, Advocate for respondent
No.2

55

+ W.P.(C) 16511/2022 and CM APPL. 51888/2022

SMT POOJA AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Ms.Meghna De and Mr.Siddharth Sapra,
Advocates



versus
GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Avnish Ahlawat Standing Counsel
GNCTD
Mr.Shivnath Kumar, Advocate for respondent
No.2

58

+ W.P.(C) 16804/2022 and CM APPL. 53105/2022

SH AJAY KUMAR AND ANRPetitioners

Through: Ms.Meghna De and Mr.Siddharth Sapra,
Advocates

versus
GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Avnish Ahlawat Standing Counsel
GNCTD
Mr.Shivnath Kumar, Advocate for respondent
No.2
Mr.Jitesh Vikram Srivastava, SPC with
Mr.Suramya Srivastava, Advocate for UOI

59

+ W.P.(C) 16810/2022, CM APPL. 53119/2022,
CM APPL. 34235/2023 and CM APPL. 62493/2023

SMT GEETA BISHT AND ANRPetitioners

Through: Ms.Meghna De and Mr.Siddharth Sapra,
Advocates

versus
GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Avnish Ahlawat Standing Counsel
GNCTD
Mr.Shivnath Kumar, Advocate for respondent
No.2
Ms.Shubhra Parashar and Mr.Virender Pratap
Singh, Advocates



63

+ W.P.(C) 2175/2023, CM APPL. 8270/2023 and
CM APPL. 5862/2024

SH LALIT GAUR AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms.Meghna De and Mr.Siddharth Sapra,
Advocates

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Avnish Ahlawat Standing Counsel
GNCTD

Mr.Shivnath Kumar, Advocate for respondent
No.2

Mr.Vijay Joshi, Advocate for UOI

69

+ W.P.(C) 3119/2024 and CM APPL. 12794/2024

JATIN BHOLA AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms.Meghna De and Mr.Siddharth Sapra,
Advocates

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Avnish Ahlawat Standing Counsel
GNCTD

Mr.Shivnath Kumar, Advocate for respondent
No.2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

10.03.2026

%

1. By way of the present writ petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners seek directions to the respondents to comply with the direction/notice issued by the Union of India through the



Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Ministry of Labour and Employment vide which the respondent was advised not to change the service condition of the workmen or terminate their services during the pendency of the dispute.

2. The petitioners further impugned the Office Order dated 22.11.2022 issued by the Revenue Department, GNCTD vide which it was directed that all the Data Entry Operators (DEOs), who had previously worked in Sub-Registrar Offices in Delhi, be surrendered and immediately replaced.

3. On petitions being filed, this Court, vide order dated 13.12.2022 had directed that the respondents shall maintain *status quo* the services of the petitioners as existing on that date.

4. Notably, the present petitions have been filed in the context of industrial disputes raised by the petitioners/workmen, who have claimed that they were engaged in the capacity of Data Entry Operators(DEOs) working in the establishment of Deputy Commissioner/District Magistrate, in different districts, Government of NCT of Delhi shown as outsourced workers on the basis of contract entered into between the Govt. of NCT of Delhi and the Contractor(s). It is claimed that the duties performed by the DEOs are of perennial and continuous in nature and the workers have been working against sanctioned vacant posts of LDC/UDC. It is further claimed that though the workmen are working under the direct and complete supervision of Management No.1, they are shown as the employees engaged through the contractor.

5. Being aggrieved with the non-regularization of their services and denial of proper pay scale, allowances, difference of salaries paid and salary of proper pay-scale of DEO, LDC/UDC on the principle of equal pay for



equal work, the petitioners approached the Conciliation Officer seeking regularization of their services along with the benefits as per pay-scale of DEO, LDC/UDC posts.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in some cases, respondent no.1's contract with respondent no.2/Contractor(s) has expired and a new Contractor has been engaged. The petitioners have approached this Court apprehending termination of their services by the respondents.

7. Pertinently, writ petitions were filed at the stage when conciliation proceedings were pending and an order directing the respondents not to change the service conditions as well as not to terminate their services during pendency of the dispute was already passed. Concededly, thereafter the matter is now stated to be pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (CGIT).

8. A gainful reference is made to the decision of the Supreme Court in Shripal and Anr. Vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad, reported as **(2025) SCC OnLine SC 221**, wherein while taking note of Section 6E of the U.P. Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which is *pari materia* to Section 33 of the Act, it was held that unilateral alteration in service conditions, including termination, is impermissible during the pendency of an industrial dispute unless prior approval is obtained from the appropriate authority.

9. Learned counsel for respondent no.1 submits that the petitioners were deployed through respondent no.2 and, with the passage of time, a new Contractor has been engaged in some of the districts. He, on instructions, submits that the service conditions of the petitioners will not be altered during the pendency of the dispute before the CGIT.

10. Considering that the dispute already stands referred and is pending



before the CGIT, the present petitions are disposed of along with pending applications with a direction that respondent no.2 would not alter the service conditions during the pendency of the dispute and with further direction that during the term of their engagement, the wages be paid regularly and arrears, if any, be also cleared within a period of one month from today.

11. The aforesaid directions shall remain operative subject to the outcome of the proceedings pending before the concerned CGIT.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MARCH 10, 2026/pmc