



\$~59

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

Date of decision: 01.09.2025

+ W.P.(C) 13375/2025
ASHOK KUMAR SAPRAPetitioner
Through: Mr.Shashank Rai, Adv.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI THROUGH
COMMISSIONERRespondent
Through: Dr.Divya Swamy, SC for MCD,
Mr.Yagyawalkya Singh,
Ms.Ananya Y., Ms.Akriti
Singh, Mr.Rishav Ranjan,
Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL. 54829/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 13375/2025 & CM APPL. 54830/2025

2. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 25.07.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal'), in M.A. No. 3111/2025, titled *Ashok Kumar Sapra v. Municipal Corporation of Delhi*, whereby notice was issued in the said M.A. and time was granted to the respondent to file its counter reply/affidavit.



3. The petitioner is aggrieved by the non-grant of an *interim* order in the said O.A.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that he is working as Multi-Tasking Staff (MTS) (PH) with the respondent. The respondent has issued a letter dated 03.07.2025, whereby all DHO/DDO of Zones and HQ have been requested to furnish information regarding regular MTS (PH) and AMI/MI appointed on an *ad hoc* basis who have completed 11 years of regular service in the Public Health Department and who possess a 10th standard qualification along with a Sanitary Inspector diploma. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that such information has not been sought for persons working on a contractual basis as MTS (PH), although the contractually appointed MTS (PH) also fulfill all the conditions stipulated in the said letter.

5. We do not find any merit in the present petition. The claim of the petitioner is to be considered by the learned Tribunal, which has already issued notice to the respondent seeking its reply. This is not a case where an *interim* order could have been granted, as that would have been equivalent to granting final relief at an *interim* stage itself.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed. The pending application is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

SEPTEMBER 1, 2025/rv/DG