

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN

WRIT APPEAL NO. 1684 OF 2026 (L-MW)

BETWEEN:

1. KARNATAKA TEXTILE MILLS ASSOCIATION
NO 64, VASTRA BHAVAN,
4TH FLOOR, 4TH MAIN,
NEAR 18TH CROSS, MALLESHWARAM,
BENGALURU - 560 055.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
MR.V.SUBASH

2. THE CLOTHING MANUFACTURERES
ASSOCIATION OF INDIA
NO 33, SWISS COMPLEX,
RACE COURSE ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGIONAL SECRETARY,
MR.BALAJI R

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. UDAYA HOLLA, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. HIEMATH PRAVEENKUMAR APPAYYA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. GARMENT AND TEXTILE WORKERS UNION (R)
GATWU)
AFFILIATED TO THE ALL INDIA CENTRAL
COUNCIL OF TRADE UNIONS (AICCTU)
NO 17/1, 1ST FLOOR, NEAR BMTC BUS STOP
NEW GUDDADAHALLI, MYSORE ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 026.

2. THE CHIEF SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
3. THE SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR,
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
4. THE UNDER SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
BENGALURU - 560 001.
5. THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER,
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU - 560 029.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT.MAITREYI KRISHNAN, ADVOCATE A/W
SRI.CLIFTON D'ROZARIO, ADVOCATE FOR C/R
IN CP 14188/2026;
SRI.S.H.RAGHAVENDRA, AGA FOR R2 TO R5)

THIS WRIT APPEAL FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO I)SET ASIDE THE COMMON
JUDGEMENT/ ORDER DATED 03/06/2026 PASSED BY THE
LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN WP NO.14466/2023 AND
CONSEQUENTLY DISMISS THE WP NO.14466/2023 AND
II)ISSUE SUCH OTHER ORDER OR DIRECTION.

THIS APPEAL HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR
ORDERS ON 21.09.2026 AND COMING ON FOR
PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN** PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
AND
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN

CAV JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN)

1. The present intra-court appeal has been preferred by respondent nos. 5 and 6 against the order dated 03.06.2026, passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P. No. 14466/2023, wherein the learned Single Judge had partly allowed the Writ Petition and had issued certain directions with respect to the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018, that was issued by the State Government proposing a revision of wages for the Garment, Costumes, Tailoring Establishments Industry (**'Garments Industry'**).
2. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred as per their ranking in the writ petition.

I. Facts of the Petitioners:

3. The petitioner–Garment and Textile Workers Union (R) is a registered trade union affiliated to the All-India Central Council of Trade Unions (**'AICCTU'**), representing workers employed in textile, garment and allied manufacturing establishments in Karnataka. The minimum

wages for the employment in Garments Industry had earlier been fixed under Notification No. KAE 1 LMW 2013 dated 21.02.2014, published in the Gazette on 01.04.2014.

4. The petitioner states that the revision was required within five years. On 09.06.2017, the petitioner submitted a memorandum to the Chairperson of the Minimum Wages Advisory Board and the Commissioner of Labour seeking revision of the wages payable to workers in the tailoring industry. Thereafter, the Government initiated the process for revision of minimum wages in the connected industries.

5. On 06.12.2017, the Karnataka State Minimum Wages Advisory Board considered the proposals and objections in respect of the connected scheduled employments. Final notifications were thereafter issued on 30.12.2017 in respect of Spinning Mills Industry, Cloth Dyeing and Printing Industry and Textiles (Silk) Industry. In relation to Garments Industry, the Government issued Draft Notification No. KAE 76 LMW 2017 dated 22.02.2018. The

petitioner submitted its objections on 02.04.2018, contending that the proposed wages were inadequate having regard to the prevailing cost of living and seeking a higher revision. Before the process could be completed, the Government, by order dated 22.03.2018, withdrew the three final notifications dated 30.12.2017 as well as the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018.

6. The withdrawal notification dated 22.03.2018 was challenged in W.P.No.18621/2018. The writ petition was dismissed on 29.03.2019 and Writ Appeal No.1520/2019 was thereafter filed, which was heard along with W.A. No. 1611/2019. During the pendency of the proceedings, the State Government issued fresh notifications dated 31.10.2019 fixing the wages for the concerned industries.

7. By judgment dated 13.04.2020 in W.A.No.1520/2019 and connected matters, the Division Bench set aside the withdrawal dated 22.03.2018, revived the earlier notifications and the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018, and directed the State Government to take further steps on the basis of the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 in

accordance with Section 5 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (**'Act of 1948'**). The said judgment was not interfered with by the Supreme Court in SLP(C) No.8240/2020 by order dated 17.07.2020. The petitioner thereafter submitted representations, including the representation dated 28.11.2022, seeking compliance with the Division Bench judgment.

8. Ultimately, the State Government issued Notification No. KAE 1 LWA 2023 dated 17.01.2023 revising the minimum wages for Garments Industry. The petitioner contended that the rates fixed under the said notification were lower than the rates contained in the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 and also lower than the rates fixed for several other scheduled employments.

9. The petitioner relied upon the wage figures relating to other industries and contended that, for an unskilled worker, the notified basic rate was only Rs.401.07/- per day, whereas the rate for certain other industries was substantially higher. As such, it was contended by the

petitioner that the rates fixed under the notification dated 17.01.2023 was insufficient.

10. Therefore, the petitioner approached the learned Single Judge in W.P. No. 14466/2023, wherein the petitioner sought, *inter alia*, revision of wages on the basis of the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 for the period from 01.04.2018 to 31.03.2023, and thereafter, on the basis of the notification dated 28.07.2022, besides seeking fixation of Rs.29,090.91/- per month as the minimum wage for an unskilled worker.

II. Facts of the Respondents:

11. The State Government, in its statement of objections, disputed the allegation that the wages fixed under Notification dated 17.01.2023 were arbitrary or unscientific. According to the State Government, the revision was undertaken by following Section 5(1)(b) of the Act of 1948. The State pointed out that Section 5 contemplated both the committee method and the notification method and that, where the notification

method was adopted, the proposals were required to be published and objections considered before the Government took a final decision. The Karnataka State Minimum Wages Advisory Board, constituted under Sections 7 and 9 of the Act of 1948, was stated to be an advisory body consisting of representatives of employers, employees and independent persons. The Board had been constituted on 16.11.2021 with 27 members.

12. The State further stated that the Government had earlier issued notifications dated 30.12.2017 and the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018, but all four were withdrawn by order dated 22.03.2018. Thereafter, a Tripartite Committee was constituted on 13.08.2018 under Section 5(1)(a) of the Act comprising representatives of trade unions, industry and Government. This committee had referred the matter to Technical Consultancy Services Organisation Karnataka ('TECSOK') that is chaired by the Additional Chief Secretary to the Government of Karnataka, C&I Department.

13. On the basis of the TECSOK's study and the Tripartite Committee's deliberations, the Government issued final notifications dated 31.10.2019. The Division Bench, by judgment dated 13.04.2020 in W.A. No. 1520/2019 and connected matters, however, held the withdrawal order dated 22.03.2018 to be unsustainable and directed the Government to take further steps on the basis of the draft notification dated 22.02.2018. The State accordingly relied upon the subsequent proceedings before the Minimum Wages Advisory Board and the consultations held thereafter.

14. The State Government specifically relied upon the meeting of the Minimum Wages Advisory Board held on 11.01.2022, in which the representation submitted by the Karnataka Textile Manufacturers Association was considered and the relevant material was placed before the Board. It was further stated that a meeting with all stakeholders was held on 06.09.2022 and their views were collected. As there was no consensus, the Government proceeded to take its own decision and issued the

notification dated 17.01.2023. The State also contended that the Advisory Board was only advisory in character and that the ultimate power to fix or revise minimum wages remained with the Government. It was therefore contended that the Court ought not to substitute its own view regarding the quantum of wages for the decision taken by the appropriate Government after considering the material placed before it.

15. Respondent Nos.5 and 6, namely the Karnataka Textile Mills Association and the Clothing Manufacturers Association of India respectively, took a substantially similar factual stand but placed greater emphasis on the material considered while fixing the wages. They pointed out that the earlier wages had been fixed on 21.02.2014, that the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 was followed by the constitution of the Tripartite Committee on 13.08.2018 and that TECSOK had thereafter undertaken a study of the garment industry concerning production capacity, average wages, profitability, comparative wages in other States and the financial condition of the industry.

They stated that the Advisory Board considered the draft notification, TECSOK Report and objections on 11.01.2022, that a further stakeholder meeting was held on 06.09.2022 and that a ministerial meeting was held on 23.11.2022 before the notification dated 17.01.2023 was issued. They further contended that both associations were impleaded as respondents on 13.01.2025 and had filed detailed objections to the petition.

III. Order in the Writ Petition:

16. The learned Single Judge, by the common judgment dated 03.06.2026, first considered the scope of interference in a matter relating to fixation of minimum wages. The Court observed that ordinarily it would not examine the merits of the decision taken by the appropriate Government if the prescribed procedure had been followed, since the principal concern of the Court would be the decision-making process. At the same time, the Court held that interference would be justified where, notwithstanding compliance with the procedure, the ultimate decision was vitiated by manifest arbitrariness,

absurdity or was unconscionable. In the case of W.P.No.14466/2023, the Court then examined whether the State had actually taken the further steps contemplated by the Division Bench judgment dated 13.04.2020 in W.A. No. 1520/2019 and connected matters.

17. In relation to the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018, the learned Single Judge noticed that it had been issued under Section 5(1)(b) of the Act of 1948 and contemplated two months' time for filing objections. The Court held that the Official Gazette containing the draft notification had not been placed before it and, since the draft notification had been withdrawn on 22.03.2018 and subsequently revived by the Division Bench on 13.04.2020, in W.A. No. 1520/2019, the State ought to have published the proposal in the Official Gazette after such revival and provided the statutory period for objections.

18. The meetings subsequently held on 11.01.2022 and 06.09.2022 were not treated as curing the omission, since

the Court regarded publication under Section 5(1)(b) as a mandatory part of the decision-making process. On that basis, the notification dated 17.01.2023 was held liable to be quashed.

19. The learned Single Judge also noticed that the notification dated 17.01.2023 proceeded on the basis of an increase of 14% over the wages contained in the notification dated 31.10.2019. The Division Bench in W.A. No. 1520/2019 had already held the notification dated 31.10.2019 to be inoperative. The learned Single Judge therefore held that the rates under the 31.10.2019 notification could not have been used as the yardstick for the subsequent revision. The Court further noticed that the rates under the notification dated 17.01.2023 appeared to be lower than those under the notification dated 30.12.2017. Though the Court recognised that the Government had the power to reduce minimum wages after following the statutory procedure, it found that the impugned notification did not disclose compelling reasons for such downward revision. Consequently, the Court

directed that a fresh exercise be undertaken in respect of Garments Industry.

20. On the question of the repeal of the Act of 1948 by the Code on Wages, 2019 (**'Code of 2019'**) with effect from 21.11.2025, the Court held that the pending proceedings did not become infructuous. It held that the rights of the workers in W.P.No.14466/2023 to have the wage revision exercise completed pursuant to the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 had crystallized by virtue of the earlier Division Bench order in W.A. No. 1520/2019.

21. The Court therefore allowed W.P.No.14466/2023 in part and directed the appropriate Government to fix/revise the minimum wages by taking further steps pursuant to the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018. The Court further directed that the effective date should be a date within five years from 21.02.2014 and, if the revised wages were higher than the existing wages, the workers would be entitled to interest at 6% per annum from the due date till payment. The exercise was directed to be completed within six months.

IV. Grounds of Writ Appeal:

22. The respondents nos. 5 and 6—Karnataka Textile Mills Association and Clothing Manufacturers Association of India respectively, who are the appellants herein, contend that the learned Single Judge proceeded on an erroneous factual premise that the draft notification dated 22.02.2018 had not been published in the Official Gazette. According to respondents nos. 5 and 6, the draft notification had in fact been published and had been acted upon in the subsequent proceedings.

23. It is further contended that the judgment of the Division Bench dated 13.04.2020 in W.A. No. 1520/2019 merely directed the Government to take “further steps on the basis of” the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 and did not require a fresh publication of the draft notification. Respondents nos. 5 and 6 rely upon the constitution/reconstitution of the Advisory Board on 16.11.2021, the meeting held on 11.01.2022, the stakeholder meeting dated 06.09.2022 and the ministerial meeting dated 23.11.2022 as the steps taken pursuant to

the directions of the Division Bench in W.A. No. 1520/2019.

24. Respondents nos. 5 and 6 also challenge the direction contained in clause (x) of the judgment, whereby the effective date of the future wage revision has been directed to be fixed within five years from 21.02.2014. It is their contention that, under Section 5(2) of the Act of 1948, the effective date was required to be specified by the Government while issuing the final notification and that the Division Bench had not directed retrospective payment of wages from 21.02.2019.

25. According to respondents nos. 5 and 6, the direction issued by the learned Single Judge would result in a retrospective liability even though the quantum of the revised wages was yet to be determined. The respondents have also questioned the direction for payment of interest at 6% per annum, contending that there was no specific prayer for interest in W.P.No.14466/2023, that the revised wages were yet to be determined and that any liability towards payment of the differential amount would arise

only depending upon the result of the fresh wage revision exercise.

26. The respondents have further questioned the direction to undertake the exercise under the Act of 1948 notwithstanding its repeal with effect from 21.11.2025, with the coming into force of the Code of 2019. Their contention is that Section 69 of the Code of 2019 saves actions already taken and accrued rights and liabilities, but does not preserve the repealed enactment as a source of power for undertaking a fresh exercise of wage fixation.

27. It is also contended that the learned Single Judge did not give due consideration to the TECSOK report, the proceedings of the Tripartite Committee, the proceedings of the Advisory Board dated 11.01.2022, the stakeholder meeting dated 06.09.2022 and the Government file notings before quashing the impugned notification on the ground of procedural non-compliance. On these grounds, the respondents seek interference with the judgment insofar as it concerns the interpretation of the earlier Division Bench judgment dated 13.04.2020, the effective

date of the proposed revision, the direction regarding interest and the effect of repeal of the Act of 1948.

28. We have heard Shri. Udaya Holla, learned Senior Counsel, on behalf of Shri. Hiremath Praveenkumar Appayya, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 5 and 6; Smt. Maitreyi Krishnan, along with Shri. Clifton D'Rozario, learned counsels appearing for petitioner no. 1; Shri. S.H. Raghavendra, learned Additional Government Advocate, appearing for respondent Nos. 1 to 4; and we have carefully perused the records of the case before us.

V. Points for our consideration:

29. The only point that arises for consideration is:

Whether the order dated 03.06.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.14466/2023 calls for interference in this appeal?

VI. Reasoning and Analysis:

30. The principal challenge in this appeal is to the finding of the learned Single Judge that, after the judgment dated

13.04.2020 in W.A.No.1520/2019 and connected matters, the State Government was required to undertake the exercise of revision of minimum wages in accordance with Section 5 of the Act of 1948 and that the procedure contemplated under Section 5(1)(b) had not been followed before issuing the notification dated 17.01.2023. In our view, the finding does not call for interference.

31. The Division Bench, by its judgment dated 13.04.2020, in W.A.No.1520/2019, had set aside the order dated 22.03.2018, revived the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 and specifically directed the State Government to take further steps on the basis of the said draft notification in accordance with Section 5 of the Act of 1948. The same judgment also made it clear that the power of the Government to revise the rates fixed under the notifications dated 30.12.2017 was subject to the procedure prescribed under the Act.

32. The contention of respondent nos. 5 and 6 that the subsequent meetings and consultations were sufficient compliance with the direction of the Division Bench cannot

be accepted. The State itself stated before the learned Single Judge that the exercise was under Section 5(1)(b) of the Act of 1948. Once that provision was invoked, publication of the proposal in the Official Gazette and giving the statutory opportunity to submit objections were not matters which could be dispensed with merely because the stakeholders had subsequently participated in meetings. The Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 had been withdrawn on 22.03.2018 and was revived only by the judgment dated 13.04.2020 in W.A.No.1520/2019. The learned Single Judge therefore rightly held that, after such revival, the statutory procedure had to be completed in accordance with Section 5(1)(b) of the Act of 1948. The meetings held on 11.01.2022 and 06.09.2022 could not take the place of the publication contemplated by the statute.

33. The reliance placed by respondent nos. 5 and 6 on the order dated 09.02.2021 in W.P.No.9268/2020 also does not advance their case. In that proceeding, the challenge to the notifications dated 30.12.2017 was not

pressed and the relief was confined to consideration of the representation dated 25.05.2020. The direction issued in that petition was only to consider the representation. It did not dispense with the statutory requirement under Section 5(1)(b) of the Act of 1948, nor did it authorise the Government to revise the wages without following the procedure prescribed by the Act. The learned Single Judge has therefore correctly distinguished the said order from the present case.

34. There is also a further difficulty in the notification dated 17.01.2023. The notification proceeded by taking the wages fixed under the notification dated 31.10.2019 as the basis and stated that the wages were enhanced by 14% over the rates fixed under that notification. However, the notification dated 31.10.2019 had already been held to be inoperative by the Division Bench in its judgment dated 13.04.2020. Once the said notification was held to be inoperative, it could not have been adopted as the foundation or yardstick for a fresh revision of wages. The learned Single Judge has noticed this factual position and,

in our view, rightly held that the Government could not proceed on the basis of a notification which had ceased to have operative effect by virtue of the earlier judgment of the Division Bench.

35. The submission that the learned Single Judge interfered merely because the wages under the notification dated 17.01.2023 were lower than the earlier wages also cannot be accepted. The learned Single Judge has specifically recorded that the Government has the power under Section 5(2) of the Act of 1948 to revise the minimum wages even by reducing them, provided the procedure prescribed under Section 5(1) of the Act of 1948 is followed. Therefore, the judgment does not proceed on the basis that every revision must necessarily be an upward revision. The notification dated 17.01.2023 was quashed principally because the statutory procedure had not been followed and additionally, because the notification proceeded on the basis of the inoperative notification dated 31.10.2019. Respondent nos. 5 to 6, therefore, cannot succeed by contending that the Court

ought to have gone into the merits of the wage rate before examining the legality of the decision-making process.

36. The challenge to the direction concerning the effective date also does not persuade us. The learned Single Judge has not directed that the wages contained in the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 shall automatically become payable. On the contrary, in paragraph 95 of the judgment, the learned Single Judge has expressly held that the wages mentioned in the draft notification were not final and that the petitioner could not seek a direction for payment at those rates. The direction is to complete the exercise of fixation/revision pursuant to the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 in accordance with law.

37. The effective date is to be determined in the final notification within the period indicated by the learned Single Judge. The judgment also expressly states that it does not mandate either an upward or a downward revision and that the appropriate Government has to decide the appropriate wages after considering the relevant factors. Thus, the apprehension of respondent

nos. 5 and 6 that the judgment itself fixes the revised wage or creates an unconditional liability for payment of arrears is not borne out from the operative directions.

38. The challenge to the direction for payment of interest stands on a different footing but, having regard to the findings recorded in the judgment, does not warrant interference. The direction is conditional. In W.P.No.14466/2023, interest at 6% per annum is payable only if the wages ultimately fixed pursuant to the fresh exercise are higher than the wages already paid. The learned Single Judge has also directed that the interest is payable only on the unpaid difference from the date on which such amount becomes due.

39. Thus, no present or quantified monetary liability has been imposed upon the respondents. The direction is consequential to the fresh determination of wages. The learned Single Judge has also noticed that the Division Bench, in its judgment dated 13.04.2020, in W.A.No.1520/2019, had upheld the direction for payment of interest at 6% on the unpaid wages relating to the

notifications dated 30.12.2017 and that the said decision had attained finality.

40. The contention based on the repeal of the Act of 1948 with effect from 21.11.2025 also cannot result in setting aside the judgment. The learned Single Judge has considered Sections 69(2) and 69(3) of the Code of 2019 along with Section 6 of the General Clauses Act, 1897. The Court has found that the rights and liabilities which had accrued before the repeal, as also the legal proceedings concerning such rights and liabilities, are saved. In the case of W.P.No.14466/2023, the right to have the wage revision exercise completed pursuant to the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 had already crystallized by virtue of the order of the Division Bench dated 13.04.2020 in W.A.No.1520/2019. The direction in the impugned judgment is therefore not a direction to initiate an entirely new exercise under a repealed statute, but to complete the exercise which had already become the subject matter of the pending proceedings and had to be carried to its logical conclusion.

41. Respondent nos. 5 and 6 have also relied upon the TECSOK report, the proceedings of the Tripartite Committee, the Advisory Board meeting dated 11.01.2022 and the stakeholder meeting dated 06.09.2022. Those materials may be relevant when the Government undertakes the exercise of fixation or revision of wages. But their existence does not answer the fundamental question as to whether the mandatory procedure under Section 5(1)(b) of the Act of 1948 was followed after the revival of the draft notification dated 22.02.2018. The learned Single Judge has not prevented the Government from considering those materials. On the contrary, the judgment leaves it open to the appropriate Government to undertake the exercise and take into account all relevant factors while fixing the wages.

42. One of the grounds raised in the appeal is that the operative portion contains a reference to the "Payment of Wages Act, 1948". Reading the judgment as a whole, it is clear that the proceedings concern the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (which has been referred to in this judgement as

the Act of 1948), Section 5 of the Act of 1948, the notifications issued for fixation of minimum wages and the repeal of that enactment by Section 69 of the Code of 2019. As such, the reference to the Payment of Wages Act, 1948 in clause (xiii) is therefore an obvious misdescription and cannot be made the basis for disturbing the substantive conclusions reached in the judgment. The rights and obligations directed to be worked out by the appropriate Government are clearly referable to the statutory exercise under the Act of 1948 which was the subject matter of the entire proceedings.

43. For all these reasons, we find that the learned Single Judge has examined the relevant orders dated 22.03.2018 and 13.04.2020, the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018, the subsequent notification dated 17.01.2023 and the steps taken by the Government thereafter.

44. The conclusion that the mandatory procedure under Section 5 of the Act of 1948 was not complied with before issuance of the notification dated 17.01.2023 does not suffer from any error warranting interference in appeal.

45. The directions issued in W.P.No.14466/2023 are limited to completing the statutory exercise pursuant to the Draft Notification dated 22.02.2018 and do not themselves determine the quantum of minimum wages.

46. Accordingly, we pass the following;

ORDER

(i) The present intra-court appeal preferred by respondent Nos.5 and 6 against the order of the learned Single Judge dated 03.06.2026, in W.P.No.14466/2023, is ***dismissed***;

(ii) The order of the learned Single Judge dated 03.06.2026 in W.P.No.14466/2023, insofar as it relates to respondent Nos. 5 to 6, is ***confirmed***.

Pending I.As. do not survive for consideration, hence, they stand disposed of.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN)
JUDGE**

KNM