

**THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR  
COURT DELHI No.1 NEW DELHI.  
ID. No. 25/2014**

Shri Surender Singh & Others, C/o Aggarwal Bhawan, G.T. Road,  
Tis Hazari, Delhi.

Workmen.....

Versus

The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Of Delhi, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, SPM Civic  
Centre, Minto Road, New Delhi 110002.

Management...

*Shri Rajiv Agarwal, A/R for the claimants.*

*None for the management.*

**Justice Vikas Kunvar Srivastava (Retd.)**

(Presiding Officer)

1. The present case is referred as an industrial dispute by the Appropriate 'Government of India' vide its order bearing no. L-42011/83/2011 (IR/(DU)) in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub section (1) and sub section 2(A) of section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 for adjudication to this tribunal. The term of reference is as below:

*“Whether the action of the management of Municipal corporation of Delhi in not regularizing the services of Shri. Surender Singh and nineteen other drivers with effect from their respective dates of joining as mentioned in the annexure is legal and justified. If not, what relief are they entitled to?”*

2. On receiving the reference the tribunal has registered the industrial dispute for adjudication as ID No. 25/2014. The dispute relates to Sh. Surender Singh and nineteen other drivers whose services were not regularized by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi in due course of law since the date of their initial joining the services with the MCD. A chart is being appended here in below containing the details of the workmen concerned with their designation, date of appointment, date of regularization and their place of posting.

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Name and Father's Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Date of appointment</b>	<b>Date of regularization</b>	<b>Present place of posting</b>
1.	Surender Singh S/o Sh. Kartar Singh	Driver	26.09.1996	01.04.04	Najafgarh Zone
2.	Ashok Kumar S/o Sh. Bhim Singh	Driver	22.06.1995	01.04.03	Mogolpuri Workshop, Rohini Zone
3.	Sh. Jai Bhagwan S/o Sh. Raghubir Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	Town Hall, City Zone
4.	Sh. Nand Kishore S/o Sh. Rati Ram	Driver	04.10.1996	01.04.04	Green Park, South Zone
5.	Sh. Anil Kumar S/o Sh. Mahender Singh	Driver	04.10.1996	01.04.04	Raghubir Nagar, West Zone
6.	Sh. Braham Prakash S/o Sh. Sukh Lal	Driver	12.10.1996	01.04.04	Green Park, South Zone
7.	Sh. Ashok Kumar Mann S/o Sh. Hari Ram Mann	Driver	12.10.1996	01.04.04	Green park South Zone
8.	Sh. Ranbir Singh S/o Sh. Karan Singh	Driver	25.09.1996	01.04.04	City Zone
9.	Sh. Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Daya Nand	Driver	13.11.1998	01.04.05	City Zone
10.	Sh. Jai Pal S/o	Driver	20.11.1998	01.04.04	City Zone

	Sh.Nafe Singh				
11.	Sh. Tulsi Ram S/o Sh. Sardare	Driver	01.04.1995	01.04.03	Najafgarh Zone
12.	Sh. Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Roop Chand	Driver	17.04.1995	01.04.03	Najafgarh Zone
13.	Sh. Padam Singh S/o Sh. Lakhmi Chand	Driver	26.08.1996	01.04.04	Najafgarh Zone
14.	Sh. Jagbir S/o Sh. Om Prakash	Driver	21.07.1995	01.03.04	Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi, Central Zone
15.	Sh. Om Prakash S/o Sh. Veer Singh	Driver	26.08.1996	01.04.04	Control Room, Najafgarh Zone
16.	Sh. Vijender Singh S/o Sh. Jagdev Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	New Delhi, Najafgarh Zone
17.	Sh. Sumer Singh S/o Sh. Chander Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	New Delhi Najafgarh Zone
18.	Sh. Sat Narain S/o Sh. Amar Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	New Delhi, Najafgarh Zone
19.	Sh. Narender Kumar S/o Sh. Charan Singh	Driver	06.05.1996	01.04.04	Central Control room, Town Hall, City Zone
20.	Sh. Bijender Singh S/o Sh. Daya Nand	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	Central Control Room, Town Hall, City Zone

### **Factual Matrix**

3. The workmen shown in the chart given hereinabove joined into the employment of the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (which shall hereinafter be called as 'MCD' only for the purpose of brevity), the opposite party

management in the present dispute. They were taken in employment as a daily rated/muster roll worker and were paid wages as fixed and revised from time to time under the Minimum Wages Act. From the date of their initial joining the workmen aforesaid were kept in continuous service of the management. They have unblemished and uninterrupted service. Though, the workmen were supposed to be regularized since their initial date of joining but the management regularized them since the date as mentioned in the table hereinabove in very arbitrary manner.

As such the case in hand is an industrial dispute with regard to the regularization of services of the workmen not w.e.f. their initial date of joining on the post of driver in proper pay scale and allowances and also of the non-payment of difference of salary on the principle of equal pay for equal work as their counterparts doing the identical work, who were treated as regular employees being paid their salary in proper pay scale and allowances etc. This is violative of Article of 14, 16 and 39 (d) of the Constitutional of India.

4. Since the dispute referred before this tribunal is relating to the regularization of the services of the claimants/workmen from an arbitrarily fixed date than the date of their initial joining in the service whether legal and justified and if, it is illegal and unjustified then, what relief the workmen/claimants concerned are entitled. The statement of claim pleads that the management of the MCD has not framed any rule or regulations nor they have any such rule or regularizations approved by U.P.S.C notified in the official gazette so as to govern the service conditions of the muster roll/part time seasonal workers. If they have not certified standing orders governing service condition of such workers, the model standing orders framed under the "Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act", 1946 are applicable to the workmen and the management of Municipal Corporation of Delhi and its undertakings. It is further pleaded in the claim statement as the workmen concerned acquired the status of permanent employee by virtue of completing 240 days of continuous employment

since the date of their initial joining into the employment provided in the Model Standing Orders under the 'Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act', 1946. In utter violation of the legal provisions and the provision of standing orders the management employed the workmen as casual or temporary and continued them as such for years together with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen which amounts to unfair labour practice as provided in section 2 (ra) read with item no. 10 of the 5<sup>th</sup> schedule of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. The demand notice was served upon the management through registered post A.D dated 20.11.2008, 03.12.2008 & 04.02.2009, which were served in their office but remained un-replied amounting to a rejection of the demand. Consequent thereupon conciliation proceeding initiated but the same went in vain due to adamant and non-cooperative attitude of the management which resulted into the reference of the present industrial dispute by the appropriate government to the tribunal for adjudication.

5. On the ground of aforesaid facts and legal positions the workmen/claimants have prayed for an award in their favour with regard to their entitlement for regularization in the services on the post of driver with effect from their respective initial date of joining into the employment and to pay the entire difference of salary from their initial joining onwards with all consequential benefits. The cost of litigation is also claimed to be awarded.

6. In answer to the claim of the workmen/claimants the management North DMS (as the MCD then was) on 17.03.2017. It is stated by the answering management that it has its own policy of regularizations namely "The Phase Manner Regularization Policy" according to which the management regularizes its daily wager muster roll employees as per availability of the posts and funds, that too strictly as per their seniority. They stated that no employee has been regularized from the date of their initial joining as daily wager. They denied the claim of the claimants of

equal pay for equal work for the period of their services spent as daily wager muster roll driver in view of the law laid on by the Apex Court and the High Court observing that the daily wager cannot be treated at par with the persons on regular service because they do not require to possess the qualification prescribed for the regular workers. They further plead that claimants were paid as per the minimum wages act and nothing is due to them as such the claim of the claimants for payment of arrears is liable to be dismissed. The claim of the workmen is further contested referring the case of **“Uma Rani vs. Registrar Cooperative Societies” (2007) 4 SCC 112**, Apex Court held-

*“Courts cannot impose on the state a financial burden of this nature by insisting on regularization or permanence in the employment of those who are employed temporarily and are not needed permanently or regularly”.*

7. On the basis of above judicial verdict the answering management has further impressed that unless an appointment is in terms of relevant rules and requirements after a proper competition amongst qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It is also impressed by the answering management that if an appointment is a contractual appointment, it comes to an end at the end of the project. If, it were an engagement or appointment on daily wages or casual basis, the same would come to an end when it is discontinued.

8. The answering management (North DMC) further clarifies that out of the list of 20 workmen only 8 are concerned with the North DMC and remaining 12 claimants have no concerned with their establishment. Chart given by them is also appended here in below showing the name and relevant details of those eight drivers.

S. No.	Name and Father's Name	Designation	Date of initial engagement as daily wager	Effective date of regularization	Present place of posting
1	Surender Singh S/o	Driver	26.09.1996	01.04.04	Rohini

	Sh. Kartar Singh				
2	Jai Bhagwan S/o Sh. Raghbir Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	Civil Line Zone
3	Ashok Kumar Mann S/o Sh. Hari Ram Mann	Driver	12.09.1996	01.04.04	Civil Line Zone
4	Ranbir Singh S/o Sh. Karan Singh	Driver	23.09.1996	01.04.04	City Zone
5	Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Daya Chand	Driver	27.11.1996	01.04.05	Edu/HQ
6	Jai Pal S/o Sh. Nafe Singh	Driver	19.11.1999	01.04.05	City Zone
7	Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Roop Chand	Driver	17.04.1995	01.04.03	Rohini Zone
8	Bijender Singh S/o Sh. Daya Chand	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04.	City Zone

On the basis of above stated averments the answering management prays that the claim of the present workmen not maintainable before the tribunal and therefore liable to be dismissed.

9. As against the reply of the answering management North DMS in their rejoinder the workmen/claimants have denied the alleged policy of regularization namely “phase manner regularization scheme”. They assertingly have stated that the concerned workmen were initially appointed against the vacant and sanctioned post of driver it is repeated that the workmen were working continuously and regularly from their initial date of joining till date with the management. Through their rejoinder the workmen/claimants concerned have vehemently denied the averment in written statement of the management that no employee has been regularized from the date of their initial engagement being false, frivolous, and concocted allegations.

### **Evidence**

10. In support of their claim the claimants/workmen have submitted before the tribunal a huge number of documents showing their prolonged

continuation in service of the management since the date of their initial appointment uninterruptedly and without anything adverse on their part. The photostate of the documents of the office order issued by the Delhi Municipal Corporation dated 23.09.1996 to the effect that 119 daily wagers/drivers were appointed on the vacant post of driver on temporary basis pursuant to their application of prescribed format through employment exchange. The said office order also reveals the due selection with approval of the panel of selected applicants, vide order dated 02.09.1996 of the additional commissioner to appoint them for 6 month on the minimum wages Rs.80.00/-per day to a maximum of Rs. 2101.00/- per month. All the 119 drivers selected and appointed through the aforesaid office order dated 23.09.1996 were given place of posting in the order itself. The said office order is not denied by the management of MCD. The said office order also reveals that the 119 drivers so selected and appointed were subjected to police verification, medical test as required under the policy of selection and appointment. Likewise several office order dated 22.08.1996 notifying selection and appointment of drivers on daily wages basis and of dated 08.10.1996, and also of other dates which are showing the utilization of said driver with their transfer to other place of posting from time to time during the span of more than further 10 years from the date of their initial appointment.

11. The claimants/workmen have placed on record documents with regard to their subsequent appointment on regular basis and probation by the period of 2 years from the date of appointment in a span of period ranging within their 2004 to 2006. They submitted their joining in accordance with the office order of regularization. The present claimants/workmen who were initially appointed long before their date of regularization in the service of the management as shown in the chart appended with para 2 hereinabove were appointed in prescribed manner legally and also get their regularization after a considerable length of service of more than 10 years on the date of their initial appointment but were given the effectiveness of the regularization from the date of their



regularization only than to relate back the benefit of regularization with the date of their initial appointment. The initial appointment of the claimants/workmen is undisputed and almost admitted as it is given through duly notified office order with the approval of competent authority of the management.

12. The Municipal Employees Union after holding a meeting of executive committee on 03.10.2008 unanimously resolved to raise an industrial dispute in favour of the present workmen/claimants for securing their regularization in service on the post of driver with retrospective effect from the initial date of their joining into the employment and to pay them entire differences of salary on the principle of 'Equal Pay for Equal Work' from their initial joining onwards with all consequential benefits. The attested copy of the resolution is placed on record proved by the claimants/witness which is marked as exhibit WW1/17. The matter was moved before the conciliation officer/the assistant labour commissioner Government of India New Delhi which is marked as exhibit WW1/19 place and proved by the claimants is also available on record. Written statement by the management was filed before the conciliation officer wherein the MCD admitted that it has regularized the service of their applicant/claimants as per phase manner policy of regularization drafted by the management as such applicants are not entitled for regularization from the date of their initial engagement. As such conciliation failed and workmen were under compulsion to get reform of industrial dispute to the tribunal for adjudication.

13. The claimants/workmen produced them as oral witnesses namely Sh. Surender Singh, Sh. Jai Bhagwan, Sh. Nand Kishore, Sh. Anil Kumar, Sh. Braham Prakash, Sh. Suresh Kumar, Sh. Tulsi Ram, Sh. Padam Singh, Sh. Jagbir, Sh. Sumer Singh, Sh. Sat Narain, Sh. Om Prakash, Sh. Suresh Kumar, Sh. Ashok Kumar Mann, and on behalf of the deceased claimants/workmen his heirs also produced themselves namely Ms. Sunita widow of Late Sh. Ashok Kumar and Ms. Anita widow of Late Sh. Ranbir Singh, Ms. Roshni

Devi widow of Late Sh. Vijender Singh, Sh. Pradeep Kumar Kaushik the secretary of the municipal employees union Sh. Jai Pal all have submitted their affidavits in oral examination as their examination in chief and also submitted themselves personally and individually for cross-examination. All the witnesses stated on oath about their initial date of appointment proving the office orders on record through which they were appointed and other documentary evidences placed on record with regard to their continuous working since the date of their initial engagement and the office order with regard to their appointment on in regularization from the date of regularization only. They stated that they are continuously discharging services with the management and have unblemished service record. Although they were supposed to be regularized since their initial date of joining but the management regularized their services with effect from 01.04.2004 only. In cross-examination also the consistently proved their initial date of appointment the management in the cross-examination stressed on the position with regard to the witnesses gave their acceptance letter of regular appointment and also that they were knowing very well the recruitment process of regular employee and daily wages employees are different. However, the witnesses expressed their unawareness about the phase manner regularization policy of the management.

Heard the learned authorized representatives of the party to the dispute and considered the facts and evidence on record.

### **Discussions**

#### **Unfair Labour Practice**

14. The initial appointment as on daily wages basis of the claimants/workmen as shown in the chart appended with the claim and made part of this judgment and award is admitted and also proved in the evidence by the claimant through documentary and oral evidences. The uninterrupted continuous service from the date of their initial

appointment till the date of their regularization in service after a considerable length of service is also admitted and proved by the office orders issued by the management itself. The posting and transfer of the claimants/workmen since after the date of their initial appointment at various places of the management MCD is proved by the office order which tends to show the services of the claimants/workmen as driver were regularly and continuously utilized which constructively show and establish the need of their deployment as driver in the routine business of the MCD. Regularization is made as against the regular vacancy of driver available in the management establishment. The facts and evidences available on record convincingly establish that the claimants/workmen as driver were continued in service on daily wages basis in utter violation of the provision of the industrial dispute act and rules.

15. The answer of the management as against the claim of regularization of the claimants/workmen in accordance with their phase regularization scheme is beyond the logical understanding. This would be noteworthy here that the management though pleaded the phase regularization scheme adopted by them but have not placed the said scheme with the proper approval and sanction of the state government or the competent authority of the management (MCD). Even particular of the scheme is not averred in the pleading submitted by the management before this tribunal. It seems that the management has deliberately employed the workmen on daily wages basis who are performing the regular nature of job of driver and treating them as mere casual/contractual employee solely for the purpose of and denying them the status and salary of regular and permanent driver. Such an action of the management amounts to unfair labour practice as provided in section 2 (ra) read with item no.10 of the 5<sup>th</sup> schedule.

16. The Apex Court in the case before it titled as “**Chief Conservator of Forest and Anr. V. Jagannath Maruti Kondhare and Ors., (1996)2 SCC 293**”, held in para 22 as follows.

*“We have given our due thought to the aforesaid rival contentions and, according to us, the object of the State Act, inter alia, being prevention of certain unfair labour practices, the same would be thwarted or get frustrated if such a burden is placed on a workman which he cannot reasonably discharge. In our opinion, it would be permissible on facts of a particular case to draw the interference mentioned in the second part of the item, if badlis, casuals or temporaries are continued as such for years. We further state that the present was such a case inasmuch as from the materials on record we are satisfied that the 25 workmen who went to Industrial Court of Pune (and 15 to Industrial Court, Ahmednagar) had been kept as casuals for long years with the primary object of depriving them the status of permanent employees inasmuch as giving of this status would have required the employer to pay the workmen at a rate higher than the one fixed under the Minimum wages Act. We can think of no other possible object as, it may be remembered that the Pachgaon Parwati scheme was intended to cater to the recreational and educational aspirations also of the populace, which are not ephemeral objects, but par excellence permanent. We would say the same about environment-pollution-care work of Ahmednagar, whose need is on increase because of increase in pollution. Permanency is thus writ large on the face of both the types of work. If, even in such projects, persons are kept in jobs on casual for years the object manifests itself; no scrutiny is required. We, therefore, answer the second question also against the appellants”*

In the above context the question arise before the tribunal that when after keeping the workmen for a considerable long lapse of time of more than a decade and the management while recognized their right of regularization in the service, regularized them, but not from the date of their initial appointment than the date of their regularization far later from their initial appointment. Whether can be held justified? And, whether the services rendered by the present claimants/workmen in their daily wager capacity for such a long time can be legalized.

17. This would be pertinent to state that though the management opposite party has referred their policy of regularization of the daily wagers/temporary employees in services of the management but no such

policy named by them in written statement as phase regularization policy is placed before the tribunal in evidence the management has also not explained the manner of regularization provided in their phase regularization policy. In the absence of the said policy on record and explanation before the tribunal by any management witness the manner adopted by the committee of regularization under the said policy and also why the workmen were not given benefit of regularization from the date of their initial appointment though kept as daily wager since then till the date of their regularization in the services.

18. The entire facts on record emerging order the pleadings of the parties along with documentary and oral evidence produced by them before the tribunal it is established that the initial appointment of the present claimants/workmen were not illegal nor irregular the nature of the work for which they were appointed was permanent and perennial. Moreover, the regularization by the management of such workmen *per-se* amounts the recognition of legality in their appointment. Contrary to this statement of claim the answer to the above questions formulated by the tribunal the answer of the management relying on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in "**Uma Rani V. Registrar Cooperative Societies, (2004) 7 SCC 112**" and in "**Secretary State of Karnartka V. Uma Devi, (2006) 4 SCC 1**" wherein it is observed that the Courts cannot impose on the state a financial burden of this nature by insisting on regularization or permanence in the employment of those who are employed temporarily and are not needed permanently or regularly does not apply. Because an appointment of the present workmen is neither illegal nor irregular as admitted by the management. The appointment is not a contractual appointment nor is it made for any time bound project nor the work is discontinued at any point of time from the date of their initial engagement till the date of their regularization.

19. Apart from the above prospects of the matter in issue for the non-applicability of the case is referred by the management, the Hon'ble Apex

Court has further held in several cases that the laws laid down in the above referred judgments do not deal with case in the realm of industrial adjudication but pertain to matters of services law jurisprudence. Some of the judgments deserves to be referred here delivered by the Apex Court with the above finding are **“ONGC Limited V. Petroleum Coal Labour Union (2016) 5 SCALE 353”**, **“Umralla Gram Panchayat V. The Secretary Municipal Employees Union, (2015) 4 SCALE 334”** and **“Ajay Pal Singh V. Haryana Warehousing Corp. (2015) 6 SCC 321”**. Wherein it is consistently held that the powers on the Industrial Adjudicator under the ID Act are very wide and as the purpose of the Act is to preempt industrial tension the adjudicator has been prescribed vast powers issued preventive as positive directions to the employers. As such this can be said that the prohibition lent on by Supreme Court for regularization in Uma Devi (Supra) does not apply to Industrial adjudication and that the Industrial Tribunal has power to direct regularization of services in cases were pursuant to unfair labour practices, employees have been made to rendered services for excessively long periods as daily wager for work that should ordinarily be done by regular employees. See the similar finding recorded by the **Hon’ble Delhi High Court** in the case before it titled as project director, **Department of Rural Development V. Its workmen reported in (2019) 2 LLJ 594.**

20. The tribunal on the basis of discussion made hereinabove relying on the judgments of the Apex Court in the cases of **Ajay Pal Singh (Supra)**, **ONGC (Supra)** **Umralla Gram Panchayat (Supra)** that denying regularization of services to a daily wager like present claimants/workmen after he has been in uninterrupted service for a very long period, tantamounts to an extremely unfair labour practice. Therefore, the services rendered by the workmen concerned to the management from the date of their initial engagement in service till the date of their regularization on a subsequent date extraordinarily later from their initial engagement falls within the extremely unfair labour practice which is illegal. Refusing the claim of claimants/workmen for regularization in

service from the date of their initial engagement rather from the date of their actual regularization in service would amount to recognizing and illegal and unfair labour practice. In view of the aforesaid finding this tribunal has got every power to adjudicate the present industrial dispute and impose upon the management a new obligation to strike a balance and secure industrial peace and harmony in the establishment.

21. Before parting with the discussion the tribunal thinks it proper to answer the objection raised by the answering North DMC is classified the some of the claimants/workmen not to be concerned with it but from the South DMC is of no avail because the Commissioner Municipal Corporation of Delhi is also made parting to the present industrial dispute and all the erstwhile Delhi Municipal Corporation or merged and amalgamated in the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD) all the claimants/workmen are employees of the MCD therefore, the adjudication in present industrial dispute of the industrial dispute referred to the tribunal by the appropriate government shall be applicable and binding upon the MCD.

22. On the facts and circumstances of the case the reference is answered vide adjudication of the Industrial dispute that management of Municipal Corporation of Delhi is wrong, unjustified and it has committed illegality in not regularizing the services of Sh. Surender Singh and 19 Ors. Drivers (Whose details are given in para 2 of the judgment) with effect from their respective dates of joining as mentioned in the chart. Consequent thereupon the above claimants/workmen are held entitled to get their order of regularization passed by the management on their respective date shown in the column no. 5 of the chart appended in para 2 of the judgment effective and enforceable since from their respective date of initial engagement as daily wager shown in column no. 4 of the chart.

## Award

23(a). The claimants/workmen are held entitled to have their order of regularization in the service on the post of driver passed by the management Municipal Corporation of Delhi on the dates shown in the chart (as shown below) against their name in column no. 5 with effect from the respective date of their initial joining shown against their name in column no. 4 in the chart retrospectively into the employment and also entitle to get all the consequential benefit including pay and seniority etc. with effect from the initial date of their joining referred hereinabove.

(b) The Municipal Corporation of Delhi is directed to pay the entire difference of salary and other emoluments payable to them with effect from their initial date of joining till the date of regularization by the management as shown in the chart appended herewith within 30 days from the date of order in case of failure to pay the differences of salary and other emoluments as ordered by the tribunal within the time prescribed in the award the MCD shall be liable to pay interest at the rate of 6% per annum from the date of their approval as such. The amount to be paid by the management under the award shall be recoverable as land revenue by the govt. in due course of procedure prescribed therefor.

(c) Since the matter was forced to be litigated in industrial court unreasonably at the behest of the management MCD from the year 2014 the claimants has incurred huge amount of money in litigation since then they shall be entitled to litigation cost and expenses. The management is imposed with to be a lump sum amount of such expenses and cost to the tune of Rs. 25000/- each payable to all the 20 workmen/claimants individually paid to the claimants and separately within 30 days from the date of order otherwise in case of failure to pay the same within prescribed period the same shall be recoverable as land revenue with interest at the rate of 6 % per annum.



(d) The office is directed to send the award to appropriate government for implementation and execution in accordance with prescribed procedure.

**CHART**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Name and Father's Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Date of appointment</b>	<b>Date of regularization</b>	<b>Present place of posting</b>
1.	Surender Singh S/o Sh. Kartar Singh	Driver	26.09.1996	01.04.04	Najafgarh Zone
2.	Ashok Kumar S/o Sh. Bhim Singh	Driver	22.06.1995	01.04.03	Mogolpuri Workshop, Rohini Zone
3.	Sh. Jai Bhagwan S/o Sh. Raghubir Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	Town Hall, City Zone
4.	Sh. Nand Kishore S/o Sh. Rati Ram	Driver	04.10.1996	01.04.04	Green Park, South Zone
5.	Sh. Anil Kumar S/o Sh. Mahender Singh	Driver	04.10.1996	01.04.04	Raghubir Nagar, West Zone
6.	Sh. Braham Prakash S/o Sh. Sukh Lal	Driver	12.10.1996	01.04.04	Green Park, South Zone
7.	Sh. Ashok Kumar Mann S/o Sh. Hari Ram Mann	Driver	12.10.1996	01.04.04	Green park South Zone
8.	Sh. Ranbir Singh S/o Sh. Karan Singh	Driver	25.09.1996	01.04.04	City Zone
9.	Sh. Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Daya Nand	Driver	13.11.1998	01.04.05	City Zone
10.	Sh. Jai Pal S/o Sh. Nafe Singh	Driver	20.11.1998	01.04.04	City Zone
11.	Sh. Tulsi Ram S/o Sh. Sardare	Driver	01.04.1995	01.04.03	Najafgarh Zone
12.	Sh. Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Roop Chand	Driver	17.04.1995	01.04.03	Najafgarh Zone
13.	Sh. Padam Singh S/o Sh. Lakhmi Chand	Driver	26.08.1996	01.04.04	Najafgarh Zone
14.	Sh. Jagbir S/o Sh. Om Prakash	Driver	21.07.1995	01.03.04	Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi, Central Zone
15.	Sh. Om Prakash S/o	Driver	26.08.1996	01.04.04	Control

	Sh. Veer Singh				Room, Najafgarh Zone
16.	Sh. Vijender Singh S/o Sh. Jagdev Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	New Delhi, Najafgarh Zone
17.	Sh. Sumer Singh S/o Sh. Chander Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	New Delhi Najafgarh Zone
18.	Sh. Sat Narain S/o Sh. Amar Singh	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	New Delhi, Najafgarh Zone
19.	Sh. Narender Kumar S/o Sh. Charan Singh	Driver	06.05.1996	01.04.04	Central Control room, Town Hall, City Zone
20.	Sh. Bijender Singh S/o Sh. Daya Nand	Driver	22.08.1996	01.04.04	Central Control Room, Town Hall, City Zone

**Justice Vikas Kunvar Srivastava (Retd.)**  
(Presiding Officer)

21.02.2024

*Ashish*