



\$~105

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

+ W.P.(C) 3779/2026

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI .....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Divya Swamy, SC, Mr.  
Yagyawalkya Singh and Ms. Akriti  
Singh, Advs.

versus

SAUDAN SINGH

.....Respondent

Through: None.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA**

**ORDER**

%

**24.03.2026**

**CM APPLs.18533/2026, 18535/2026 (Exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Applications stand disposed of.

**CM APPL.18534/2026 (seeking permission to file additional documents)**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present application.
4. The same is dismissed as withdrawn.

**W.P.(C) 3779/2026 and CM APPL.18532/2026**

5. The present petition assails an award dated 20.09.2025, passed by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-II, Rouse Avenue Courts, New Delhi, in POIT No.278/2019.
6. The respondent / workman was initially engaged as a daily wager / muster-roll worker on the post of Beldar in the year 1984 and was subsequently regularized by the petitioner w.e.f. 18.08.2004, in accordance with its regularization policy.



7. It is contended that despite accepting such regularization, the respondent raised an Industrial Dispute in 2018, after a delay of approximately 14 years, seeking retrospective regularization from 01.01.1990 along with consequential benefits and differential wages.
8. The Industrial Tribunal by way of the impugned award, allowed the claim and granted retrospective regularization w.e.f. 01.01.1990 along with all consequential monetary benefits and also directed payment of differential wages for the period 01.01.1990 to 18.08.2004, with interest from the date of reference.
9. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner has filed present petition contending that the Tribunal erred in granting retrospective regularization, contrary to the settled law governing public employment, particularly where initial engagement was not through a proper selection procedure.
10. It is further contended that the respondent's claim was barred by delay and also on the analogy of principles of waiver and estoppel.
11. Issue notice to the respondent, on necessary steps being taken by the petitioner, through all permissible modes, including electronically.
12. Let reply be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within four weeks thereafter.
13. In the meantime, subject to the petitioner depositing the monetary benefits due and payable to the petitioner in terms of the impugned award (along with interest till the date of payment), within a period of eight weeks from today, the operation of the impugned award shall remain stayed.
14. List on 07.09.2026.

**MARCH 24, 2026/cl**

**SACHIN DATTA, J**