



2026:DHC:4324



\$~5

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

+

W.P.(C) 5720/2026

NARDEV SINGH DRALL

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sujata Singh, Adv.

versus

M/S THE STATESMAN LTD

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA****SACHIN DATTA, J. (ORAL)**

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner assails the order dated 12.12.2022 passed by the Joint Labour Commissioner-cum-Authority under the Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955, whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Section 17(1) of the said Act for recovery of dues, was dismissed.

2. It is noticed that in an identical conspectus, a Coordinate Bench of this Court, while dealing with a batch of petitions [viz. W.P.(C) 12305/2023 and connected matters], passed the following order dated 28.01.2026:

"1. By way of the present Writ Petitions, the petitioners, who are claiming themselves to be the employees of respondent No.3, are aggrieved by the order dated 12.12.2022 passed by the Joint Labour Commissioner-cum-Authority under the Working Journalist and other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service & Miscellaneous) Provisions Act, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), in their claim petitions under Section 17(1) of the Act for recovery of arrears in terms of the recommendation of the Manisana Wage Board Award,



2026:DHC:4324



which was re-notified by the Central Government on 13.10.2020 (hereinafter referred to as the “Notification”).

2. Vide the impugned order, the concerned Authority had dismissed the claim petitions in the backdrop of the fact that the challenge to the Notification was pending consideration before this Court in WP (C) 11172/2021. However, liberty was granted to the petitioners to file fresh claim petitions if the Notification gets upheld. Concededly, in the pending writ petition, there is no stay of the said Notification.

3. Considering that there is no stay of the Notification, the claim application is restored to its original position, and the Authority is directed to proceed with the same.

4. Accordingly, the present petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 objects qua the maintainability of the claim application filed under Section 17(1) of the Act.

6. Needless to state that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claim application. The objections on maintainability, if any, be considered by the Authority, in accordance with law.

7. Registry is directed to forward a copy of this order to the Authority.”

3. In the circumstances, the present petition is disposed of in the same terms.

4. Consequently, the concerned authority is directed to decide the matter in terms thereof.

MAY 11, 2026/cl

SACHIN DATTA, J