

28 to 37

\$~

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 660/2012 & CM APPLs. 17165/2012 AND 6792/2013

UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ORS Petitioners

Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.

versus

AMIT SINGHLA & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.

with

+ CONT.CAS(C) 794/2012

UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.

versus

AMIT SINGLA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.

With

+ CONT.CAS(C) 883/2012

UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.

versus

AMIT SINGLA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.

With

- + CONT.CAS(C) 212/2013
UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ANR. Petitioners
Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.
versus
AMIT SINGLA & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.
With
- + CONT.CAS(C) 395/2013
UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ANR Petitioners
Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.
versus
DR MADHU RANI TEOTIA, ADDL DIRECTOR
OF EDUCATION (ACT-I) & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.
With
- + CONT.CAS(C) 445/2013
UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ANR Petitioners
Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.
versus
MRS INDIRA RANI SINGH & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.
With
- + CONT.CAS(C) 651/2013
UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ORS Petitioners
Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.
versus
SHRI JANG BAHADUR SINGH & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.

With

+ CONT.CAS(C) 690/2013

UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ORS Petitioners
Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.

versus

DR A YASMEEN & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.

With

+ CONT.CAS(C) 265/2014

UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ORS Petitioners
Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.

versus

MS PADMINI SINGHLA & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Naushad Ahmed Khan, Advocate
for GNCT of Delhi.

And

+ CONT.CAS(C) 531/2014

UPRAS VIDYALAYA & ANR Petitioners
Through: Dr. S.N. Singh, General Secretary of
petitioner.

versus

DR. AFSHAN YASHMIN & ANR Respondents
Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate for GNCT of
Delhi.

%

Date of Decision : 1st December, 2015

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

J U D G M E N T

MANMOHAN, J: (Oral)

1. Today once again Dr. S.D. Singh, General Secretary of the petitioners prays for an adjournment on the ground that petitioner's counsel has not fully recovered from Dengue.
2. On the last date of hearing, on the same request this Court had adjourned the matters. However, this Court had clarified on the last date of hearing that no adjournment would be granted today.
3. Moreover, as the petitioners have had enough time to make alternative arrangements, this Court disallows the plea for adjournment.
4. It is pertinent to mention that the present batch of contempt petitions has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the interim orders dated 20th July, 2012 and 22nd August, 2012 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.(C) 4308/2012.
5. By the said orders, the interim relief in favour of the petitioners was declined due to serious allegations against the petitioners.
6. However, to ensure that the working of the school did not come to a standstill, a representative of the petitioner No.1-school was directed to approach the Deputy Director for release of payments.
7. The Deputy Director was directed to consider the said request and permit the school to make such payments as he/she may deem fit for the day-to-day running of the school.
8. In the present batch of petitions, it has been alleged that in utter disregard of the aforesaid interim orders, the respondents did not release the payments in order to disrupt the smooth functioning of the school at the behest of one Mr. Baleshwar Rai, ex-Director of Education, GNCT of Delhi with malafide intent.
9. However, upon a conjoint reading of the orders dated 20th July, 2012 and

22nd August, 2012, this Court is of the opinion that not only the interim relief was declined to the petitioners, but absolute discretion was given to the respondents' officials to release the payments. There was no legal vested right in the petitioners to claim that any payment should be released.

10. The allegations of malafide and pressure being exerted by Mr. Baleshwar Rai are completely unfounded. In fact, upon perusal of the paper books, this Court is of the opinion that the present contempt petitions had been filed as a matter of strategy to coerce and arm-twist the officials of the respondent.

11. Consequently, present contempt petitions and applications are dismissed and the notices issued are discharged.

MANMOHAN, J

DECEMBER 01, 2015

js