



\$~71

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14325/2025 and CM APPL. 58708/2025**

PANDIT RAM GOPAL SHARMAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Pandit Ram Gopal Sharma,
Advocate.

versus

SHIV SHAKTI MANDIR TRUST & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr Amit Saxena, Mr. Manoj Kumar Tyagi, Mr Sachin Hitkari, Mr. Nikhil Kumar, Abhishek Sharma Advocates alongwith Mr Pujya Kumar Singh, Advocates for R-1 to 3 along with Respondent No.3 in person.
Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel Counsel (Civil) GNCTD with Mr Siddharth Arora, Advocates for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **18.03.2026**

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

“a) Issue a writ of Certiorari / Mandamus / Prohibition quashing all illegal actions, notices, and threats issued by the Respondents against the Petitioner.

b) Declare the present Committee (Respondent Nos. 1-3) illegal, void, and functus officio, for failure to hold elections as per Clause 4(d) of the Trust Constitution.

c) Direct reinstatement of the Petitioner as Head Priest with continuity of service and full protection from illegal termination and eviction.

d) Direct Respondents to pay arrears of wages as per Delhi Government



minimum wages for the last 7 years with 12% interest.

e) Award compensation of Rs. 10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lakhs) to the Petitioner for harassment, exploitation, mental agony, and humiliation.

f) Direct Respondent No. 4 (Registrar of Societies) to take appropriate action against the illegal functioning of the present Committee.”

2. The petitioner essentially seeks for the directions to the respondent nos. 1 to 3 to allow the petitioner to continue with the services of the priest. Additionally, the petitioner also seeks for direction for minimum wages for last seven years with 12% interest as well as award of compensation to the tune of Rs. 10 lakhs.

3. The Court, however, finds that the nature of the reliefs prayed by the petitioner may not be amenable to be granted under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

4. Even otherwise, if the petitioner is a priest with the respondent-trust, the dispute essentially concerns his service, remuneration, and continuity of employment, which fall squarely within the realm of civil rights. The respondents contend that no cause of action exists, as the petitioner has allegedly entered into a compromise with them, whereas the petitioner's counsel denies any such compromise. These conflicting contentions give rise to substantial disputed questions of fact, including the legality of the present Committee, entitlement to minimum wages, and the validity of the proposed termination, all of which will require proper scrutiny by the Court of competent jurisdiction.

5. The decision relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioner in the case of ***Menaka Gandhi vs. Union of India***¹, would have no application under the facts of the present case.

¹ AIR 1978 SC 597



6. The petitioner shall be at liberty to take the appropriate remedy as may be available in law.
7. With the aforesaid liberty, the petition stands disposed of.
8. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 18, 2026

aks/ss