



\$~59

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6149/2024**

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC GNCTD
with Ms. Aliza Alam, Mr. Nitesh
Kumar Singh & Mr. Mohnish
Sehrawat, Advs.

versus

TARUN KUMAR AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jawahar Raja, Mr. Siddharth
Sapra, Ms. Meghna De, Ms. L.
Gangmei, Mr. Nitai, Mr. Ishaan Goel,
Advs. for Applicant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

ORDER

09.10.2025

%

CM APPL. 63430/2025 [Clarification]

1. This is an Application filed on behalf of the Applicant/Dheeraj Tiwari seeking clarification of the order dated 23.04.2025.
2. The present Application has been placed before this Court since the order seeking clarification was passed by this Court.
3. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is not a party in the present proceedings, however, the order passed by this Court on 23.04.2025 is being referred to in execution proceedings being Ex.No. 128/2024 captioned *Dheeraj Tiwari & Ors v. District Magistrate (EAST)* by the Decree Holders [the Petitioners herein], to submit that all proceedings have been kept in abeyance. He submits that this clearly is not borne from



the order since the execution proceedings filed by the Applicant is not the same as is set out in paragraph 6 of the order dated 23.04.2025 passed by this Court.

4. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, who appears on advanced service, submits that although the Applicant is not part of this Petition, he is one of the 298 workmen who have raised an industrial dispute against the Petitioner. It is submitted that 16 petitions have been filed by these workmen, which include the Applicant and several others raising an industrial dispute.

5. At this stage, it is apposite to set out the relevant extract of the order dated 23.04.2025 passed by this Court, which is below:

“6. In the meantime, the order dated 14.02.2025 passed in Ex. No. 138/2024 captioned ***Tarun Kumar and Ors v. District Magistrate EAST*** is kept in abeyance till the next date of hearing.”

5.1 The order that has been passed is self-explanatory and seeks to keep in abeyance the proceeding in Ex.138/2024 captioned ***Tarun Kumar & Ors. v. District Magistrate EAST.***

6. It is not disputed by either party that the Applicant is not a party in the present Petition either. However, as contended by the Petitioner, the Applicant is a part of a separate industrial dispute which is pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

7. The matter requires further examination.

8. Issue Notice.

8.1 Learned Counsel for the Petitioner accepts Notice and seeks time to file a Reply.

9. Reply be filed within two weeks.



9.1 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within one week thereafter.

10. Learned Counsel for the parties submit that the matter can be heard by the Roster Bench since it is dealing with the gamut of disputes.

10.1 Accordingly, list the Application before the Roster Bench, on the date already fixed i.e., 18.11.2025, subject to the orders of Hon'ble the Chief Justice.

11. The parties shall act based on the digitally signed copy of the order.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

OCTOBER 9, 2025/ ha