

\$~9

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 3525/2016
ASHA RANI Petitioner
Through Ms.Indrani Ghosh and
Ms.Nidhi Jacob, Advocates

versus

MANAGING COMMITTEE ST. ANGEL'S SCHOOL & ORS
..... Respondents
Through Mr.Angel Bhardwaj, Advocate for
R-1 to-3
Ms.Sakshi Popli, Advocate for R-4/DOE

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

% **ORDER**
04.10.2016

CM APPL. 35642/2016 (for clarification of the order dated 30.5.2016)

1. The present application has been filed by the petitioner for seeking clarification of the order dated 30.5.2016, particularly para 7 thereof.
2. Vide order dated 30.5.2016, the present petition was disposed of with directions to the respondents to defer the enquiry proceedings in respect of the petitioner, till 30.7.2016. Further, keeping in mind the fact that the enquiry proceedings in respect of the petitioner had been initiated by the respondent No.1 in the month of May 2015 and the same were not concluded after expiry of one year, the Inquiry Officer was directed to expedite the said proceedings and conclude the same preferably within two months reckoned from 1.8.2016. The period of two months reckoned from

1.8.2016, had expired on 30.9.2016.

3. Counsel for the petitioner states that under the garb of complying with the order dated 30.5.2016, the Inquiry Officer is trying to cut short the evidence of the parties, which is impermissible.

4. The aforesaid submission is however denied by learned counsel for the respondents No.1 to 3, who appears on advance notice. He submits that out of six witnesses cited by the Management, the evidence of the three witnesses stands concluded and the next date fixed for recording the evidence of the remaining witnesses is 5.10.2016. He submits that during the cross-examination of the management witnesses, the petitioner has posed as many as 640 questions to the witnesses.

5. The aforesaid submission is however denied by learned counsel for the petitioner who seeks to draw the attention of the court to the order sheets filed along with the present application, to contend that the Inquiry Officer is unnecessarily curtailing the cross-examination of the witnesses, to the detriment of the petitioner.

6. It is clarified that the Inquiry Officer is empowered to disallow any irrelevant questions that may be posed by the petitioner. However, this would not mean that relevant questions posed to the management witnesses be turned down only to conclude the enquiry in a hurry.

7. The application is disposed of, with the aforesaid clarification.

HIMA KOHLI, J

OCTOBER 04, 2016/mk/ap
W.P.(C) 3525/2016

Page 2 of 2