



\$~5

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **LPA 724/2025, CM APPL. 75349/2025 & CM APPL. 75350/2025**
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI TROUGH ITS
COMMISSIONERAppellant

Through: Mr.Anand Prakash, SC for MCD with
Ms.Varsha Arya and Mr.Darsh
Bansal, Advs.

versus

BHUPENDER PAL AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr.Jawahar Raja, Mr.Ishaan Goel, and
Mr.Nitai Hinduja, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **10.03.2026**

CM APPL. 75351/2025 (Delay)

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the appellant-MCD seeking condonation of delay of 301 days in filing the instant appeal.
2. Having heard the learned counsel for the appellant-MCD and perused the averments made in the present application, the same stands allowed and the delay of 301 days in filing the instant appeal is hereby condoned.
3. The application stands disposed of.

LPA 724/2025, CM APPL. 75349/2025 & CM APPL. 75350/2025

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
5. This Letters Patent Appeal seeks to challenge an *interlocutory* order dated 16.12.2024 whereby, the appellant-MCD has been directed to make a payment of Rs.20,000/- to each of the respondents/workmen towards litigation expenses.



6. The proceedings of the writ petition have been instituted by the appellant-MCD against an award dated 21.07.2023, declared by the Industrial Tribunal whereby, the respondents/workmen have been held to be entitled for regularisation in service on the post of Assistant Pump Driver. A direction has also been issued to regularise their services with effect from 01.04.2006 in regular pay scale.

7. The submission of the learned counsel for the appellant-MCD is that the respondents/workmen were Seasonal Employees and, therefore, the Learned Tribunal has erred in arriving at the finding that they are entitled to the regularisation.

8. Be that as it may, the merit of the respective claim of the parties is yet to be considered by the learned Single Judge.

9. By the order impugned herein, the learned Single Judge has only directed the appellant-MCD to pay a sum of Rs.20,000/- to each of the respondents/workmen towards litigation expenses.

10. Having regard to the fact that the respondents/workmen are not in employment since long and also taking into consideration the fact that the order under challenge is an order which is *interlocutory* in nature, we are not inclined to interfere in this appeal, which is hereby dismissed.

11. We, however, request the learned Single Judge to expedite the proceedings of the writ petition along with the miscellaneous applications, if any, and conclude the same, if possible, within a period of three months.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

MARCH 10, 2026/MJ