



\$~116

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

% ***Date of Decision: 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2025***

+ CM(M) 1297/2025 & CM APPL. 43158-43159/2025  
PREM RAJ SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Chirayu Jain, Advocate.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Vasu Singh, Advocate.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. The petitioner herein is workman before the learned Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court – 02.
2. When the matter was taken up by the learned Tribunal on 24.04.2025, it observed that the Tribunal was empowered to create its own procedure considering the facts of each case and while further observing that the matter could be decided on the basis of oral arguments only, has directed the parties to come prepared for oral arguments.
3. The grievance of the workman is, merely, limited to the effect that the workman should have been given an opportunity to lead its evidence.
4. He submits that, mere fact that the medical card had not prepared, would not, *ipso facto*, mean that any such workman is not even entitled to any reimbursement pertaining to medical expenditure.



5. Learned Counsel for respondent appears through video conferencing on advance notice and during the course of the arguments, on the basis of the query raised by this Court, submitted that, without prejudice to her rights and contentions, she would have no objection if the parties are rather permitted to lead evidence before the learned Tribunal.
6. Quite clearly, the important issue is whether a workman, who does not possess a medical card, is still entitled to seek medical reimbursement, being admittedly, a retired employee of MCD.
7. The clear picture would emerge only once the parties are permitted to lead evidence and, therefore, summary adjudication does not look appropriate.
8. Therefore, keeping in mind the overall facts of the case, the present petition is disposed of with direction to learned Tribunal to permit the parties to lead their respective evidence. Needless to say, in view of aforesaid, the workman would also be permitted to file its rejoinder, with advance copy to the Management.
9. Petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.
10. Pending applications also stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.
11. It is, however, clarified that this Court has not made any observation on the merits of the claim in question.

**(MANOJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**JULY 21, 2025/sw/SS**