



\$~42

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 6669/2023, CM APPLs.. 26114/2023, 21693/2024
TIGER 4 INDIA LTD AND ANRPetitioners
Through: Mr. Rahul Saini, Advocate

versus
GOVIND KUMAR JHARespondent
Through: Mr. Kumar Amit, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

% **ORDER**
13.05.2026

1. By way of the present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners-management seek to assail the order dated 10.11.2022 passed by the Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), Ministry of Labour and Employment, acting as the Authority under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948, at Office, 4th Floor, Jeevan Deep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi, in Claim Application No. 334/2021, whereby the management was directed to pay difference in wages amounting to Rs. 1,62,894/- along with compensation at the rate of three times the said amount. Additionally, a sum of Rs. 1,60,275/- was directed to be paid towards overtime wages. Consequently, a total sum of Rs. 8,11,851/- was directed to be paid to the respondent-workman.

2. A perusal of the record would reveal that the aforesaid order came to be passed in the context of a claim application, wherein the workman claimed that he had been employed with the management as a Care Taker from 01.06.2018 to 28.02.2021. The management was stated to be engaged in the business of providing security guards and caretakers, which



constituted scheduled employment under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. The workman further claimed that he had been paid wages lower than the minimum wages fixed for the relevant category of employment under the Act, to the extent of Rs. 170/- to Rs. 177/- per day for the period from June 2018 to 15.03.2021. It was additionally claimed that wages for weekly days of rest at the rate of Rs. 553/- to Rs. 639/- per day for the aforesaid period had not been paid. He also claimed that he had not been paid the overtime wages for the said period. .

3. The management appeared before the Authority and filed its reply. In the reply, it was stated that the workman was not performing his duties with utmost devotion which led to his termination.

4. Before this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner while assailing the impugned order, relies upon the show-cause notice dated 16.03.2021 as well as certain photographs in support of the allegations against the workman. However, on a court question, it is conceded by the petitioner that the said documents do not form part of record before the Authority.

5. Section 20(3)(i) of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 stipulates that where, in a claim arising out of payment of wages at a rate less than the minimum rates of wages, the Authority finds the claim to be established, it may direct the employer to pay the difference between the minimum wages payable under the Act and the wages actually paid, together with such compensation as the Authority may deem fit, not exceeding ten times the amount of such difference.

6. The management did not contest the quantum of the claim raised in the claim application and had merely stated that the workman was not performing his duties with full devotion. The amount claimed by the



workman having not been specifically denied, the Authority was justified in proceeding on the basis of the unrebutted claim placed before it.

Further, the compensation awarded falls within the ambit of powers conferred upon the Authority under Section 20(3)(i) of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. This Court further takes note of the limited scope of writ jurisdiction in exercise of powers conferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. It is well settled that the challenge is not in the nature of appeal, but to seek if the order is passed without jurisdiction, is perverse or did not follow principle of natural justice [Ref: Syed Yakoob v. K.S. Radhakrishnan¹]. The same principle was reiterated by the Supreme Court in International Airport Authority of India v. International Air Cargo Workers Union². This Court has also considered the scope of its writ jurisdiction in Ritz Theatre Private Limited v. Ramesh Chandra³.

7. In view of the aforesaid, I find no ground to entertain the present writ petition and the same is accordingly dismissed with pending applications.

8. The petitioner had deposited a sum of Rs. 3,23,169/-, which amount has already been released to the respondent in terms of the order dated 25.02.2026. The remaining amount shall also be released to the respondent within a period of four weeks from today.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MAY 13, 2026/rd

¹ 1963 SCC OnLine SC 24

² (2009) 13 SCC 374

³ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 3633