



2025:DHC:6778-DB



\$~1 (SPL. DB)

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

+ LPA 889/2024

DELHI TRANSPORT CORPORATIONPetitioner
Through: Ms. Manisha Tyagi, Adv.

versus

ASHOK KUMARRespondent
Through: Ms. Shivani Verma, Adv. with
Mr. Ahsan Sanjar, Ms. Pragya Jaishwal,
Adv. for Mr. Kamlesh Kr Mishra, Adv.
respondent in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER (ORAL)

%

08.08.2025

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

**REVIEW PET. 13/2025 & CM APPLs. 1395/2025, 1396/2025,
1397/2025**

1. Issue notice. Notice is accepted on behalf of respondent/non-applicant by Ms. Shivani Verma.

2. At the outset, Ms. Manisha Tyagi, learned Counsel for the review petitioner, presses the review petition only to the extent of correction of date of 18 March 1986 as reflected in para 24 of judgment dated 4 September 2024. The said para reads thus:

“24. Thus, in the peculiar facts of the present case, this Court directs the appellant to treat the respondent reinstated in service from the date he was terminated from service i.e. 18.03.1986 and



his pay, allowances and seniority be fixed as per his eligibility and he be paid 50% wages as due to him. This Court also directs the appellant to pay respondent Rs.2.5 lacs towards litigation expenses and compensation. The appellant is directed to comply with the directions of this Court within four weeks.”

3. Ms. Tyagi’s contends, which is not disputed by Ms. Shivani Verma, is that the date of 18 March 1986 should read as 20 July 1993.

4. Accordingly, para 24 of the judgment dated 4 September 2024 shall read thus:

“24. Thus, in the peculiar facts of the present case, this Court directs the appellant to treat the respondent reinstated in service from the date he was terminated from service i.e. 20.07.1993 and his pay, allowances and seniority be fixed as per his eligibility and he be paid 50% wages as due to him. This Court also directs the appellant to pay respondent Rs.2.5 lacs towards litigation expenses and compensation. The appellant is directed to comply with the directions of this Court within four weeks.”

5. This order shall be treated as a corrigendum to the judgment dated 4 September 2024.

6. At this point, Ms. Tyagi intervenes and submits that the judgment dated 4 September 2024 passed by us does not note the fact that the respondent had already received an amount of ₹ 2,15,374/- under Section 17-B of the ID Act.

7. We find that this fact has specifically been noted in para 15 of the judgment dated 4 September 2024 under challenge.

8. Accordingly, except for modifying the date in para 24 as already noted hereinabove, we are not inclined to pass any further



2025:DHC:6778-DB



orders in this review petition, which is accordingly dismissed.

9. Accompanying applications also stand disposed of.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J.

AUGUST 8, 2025

dsn