

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.24901 of 2016

Ashok Kumar and another

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

(2)

CWP No.25918 of 2016

Poonam and another

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

Decided on :16.12.2016

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA

Present : Dr. Surya Parkash, Advocate
for the petitioners.

G.S. Sandhawalia, J. (Oral)

The petitioners in ***CWP No.24901 of 2016*** seek the quashing of the affiliation/recognition order dated 19.06.2009 (Annexure P-1) issued by the Department of School Education, Haryana and the recognition order dated 17.05.2010 (Annexure P-2) issued by the Director School Education, Haryana, in favour of the private respondents.

Similarly in ***CWP No.25918 of 2016***, the affiliation/recognition order for the B.Ed Course dated 26.10.2007 (Annexure P-7) issued by the National Council for Teachers Education and the permission to admit for Diploma of Elementary Education dated 18.08.2008 (Annexure P-12) has been sought to be quashed.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP Nos.24901 and 25918 of 2016

-2-

Counsel has been asked to demonstrate the *locus standi* of the petitioners, in view of Para No.28 of the writ petition in ***CWP No.24901 of 2016***, which is identical to Para No.26 of the writ petition in ***CWP No.25918 of 2016***. The same shows the grouse of the petitioners on account of which the above challenge has been raised. The said paragraphs read as under:-

“28. That petitioner No.2 cousin of the petitioner No.1 was staying with the petitioner No.1 and it was on the asking of the petitioner No.1, she took admission in the B.Ed course run by respondent No.4, but after her admission, they started running the school in the same building and as such could not impart proper B.Ed training and due to this reason, she could not clear the Haryana Teachers Eligibility Test and as such her future has been ruined by the respondents.”

In view of the above, it is always open to the petitioners to seek his remedies before the Court of competent jurisdiction, as disputed questions are being raised regarding the availability of the land available with the private respondents.

Faced with the abovesaid situation, counsel chose to not press the present writ petitions with liberty to avail his alternative remedies.

Ordered accordingly.

DECEMBER 16, 2016
Naveen

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes

Whether Reportable:

No