

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.2681 of 2015

Date of Decision.23.02.2015

Sushant and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Ankit Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. All these petitioners are students who have a grievance that in spite of a direction given by a Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.7447 of 2010 titled "Satbir Singh Hooda Vs. State of Haryana" requiring the students belonging to EWS categories to be granted admission in private schools, the private schools have been flouting the orders of the High Court and also the admission process that was put in motion subsequent to the rules that were framed by the Haryana Government. The counsel would state that they have been able to stall admission by taking advantage of one order that was passed by this Court in CWP No.4925 of 2014 titled "Haryana Progressive School's Conference Vs. Union of India and others". The Court has passed an interim order in C.M. No.5416 of 2014 restricting any coercive action to be taken against the particular school which was in breach, taking note of the fact that the Government was not filing its counter and explaining

its stand. The direction given by the Division Bench is used by every other school to deny admission to the students. It will be only appropriate that the petitioners approach the Division Bench where the issue is at large in CWP No.4925 of 2014 and take appropriate direction by way of clarification by seeking impleadment. The writ petition seeking for enforcement of the order which is already passed by the Division Bench and for direction which has been given is a needless replication of efficacious remedy which would be possible before the Division Bench where the matter is pending.

2. The writ petition is disposed of with the above direction giving the liberty to the petitioners to approach the Division Bench for appropriate redressal.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 23, 2015
Pankaj*