



\$~31 to 34

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 203/2008
UOI THR. SECRETARY MINISTRY OF HEALTH &
FAMILY WELFAREPetitioner
Through: Mr. Jivesh Kumar Tiwari
CGSC, Ms. Nandini Aggarwal, Adv

versus

CHAHAT RAM & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Ranbir Yadav, Adv.

+ W.P.(C) 1821/2008, CM APPL. 3508/2008, CM APPL.
3510/2008
U.O.I & ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Jivesh Kumar Tiwari
CGSC, Ms. Nandini Aggarwal, Adv

versus

ASHOK KUMAR & ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Ranbir Yadav, Adv.

+ W.P.(C) 9512/2009
DIRECTOR GENERAL ESIC HEADQUARTER
& ORSPetitioners
Through: Ms. Prema Priyadarshini with
Mr. Priyansh Kanwar and Mr. Vikash
Kumar Roy, Adv.

versus

ANIL KUMAR KALRA & ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Ranbir Yadav, Adv.

+ W.P.(C) 9296/2017, CM APPL. 37993/2017
PUNEET AND ANR.Petitioners
Through:



versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. A.K. Verma, Panel Counsel
for respondent.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER
% **15.04.2026**

1. Ms. Prema Priyadarshini, learned Counsel for the ESIC seeks time.
2. None of the Counsel appearing for the ESIC is able to dispute the fact that the respondents are persons who are situated similarly to the respondents in WP(C) 6414/2015¹, WP(C) 3781/2011², WP(C) 18/2015³, WP(C) 6423/2015⁴, WP(C) 8261/2016⁵, WP(C) 8264/2016⁶ as several of the respondents in the said writ petitions are still continuing in service.
3. In that view of the matter, we are *prima facie* of the view that keeping in view the mandate of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India, there is no justification for this Court refusing to extend, to the respondents, the benefit of the order dated 4 February 2026 passed in the aforementioned writ petitions.

¹ The Director General (ESIC) & Ors. v. Rakesh Saini and Ors

² Director General ESI Head Quarter & Anr. v. Anita Yadav & Ors

³ Director General ESI Corporation & Anr. v. Braham Pal & Ors

⁴ The Director General (ESIC) & Ors. v. Kirti Sharma & Ors

⁵ Director General (Employees State Insurance Corporation) & Ors. v. Munish Kumar & Ors.

⁶ Director General (Employees State Insurance Corporation) & Ors. v. Dharambir Singh Ranga and Ors



4. Nonetheless, at request of Ms. Prema Priyadarshini, renotify on 23 April 2026 as part-heard in the Supplementary List.

5. We have made it clear to learned Counsel for the petitioner, if there is no change in the position till next date of hearing, these petitions would be disposed of in terms of order dated 4 February 2026 passed in WP(C) 3136/2006.

6. Mr. Verma, who appears for the respondent in WP(C) 9296/2017, submits that this writ petition is different from the others as in this case the Tribunal had held in favour of the ESIC.

7. Having heard Mr. Verma on this aspect, we are not inclined to agree with the submission.

8. The only difference between the other writ petitions and WP(C) 9296/2017 is that the employees who are affected are respondents in the other writ petitions and petitioners in WP(C) 9296/2017. Apart from this, to our mind, there is no difference between the petitioners in WP(C) 9296/2017 and the respondents in the other writ petitions.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

APRIL 15, 2026/At