

\$~37

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4303/2016**

PRAMILA PAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Saurabh Chadda, Advocate.

versus

MANAGING COMMITTEE OF DELHI

ENGLISH ACADEMY SCHOOL & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. M.K. Dhingra, Advocate for R-1.
Mr. Devvrat, Advocate for R-2 with
Mr. Anil Kumar for the office of
DOE.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

% **21.11.2016**

1. The impugned order dated 10.10.2015 passed by respondent no.

1/School is a non-speaking order and the same reads as under:-

“To
Ms. Pramila Pal
R/o RZ-77-13, Gali No. 1
Kailashpuri, Palam Colony,
N.D - 45

Subject :- Reply of Representation regarding back wages.

We would like to bring your kind notice that we have considered your representation and after the consideration, We tend to reject your representation on the Principle of ‘NO WORK NO PAY’. Further inquiry

on this matter is going on.

-sd-

T.C. Verma
Manager”

2. Since *quasi judicial* powers are exercised under Rule 121 of the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973, such an order will have to be a speaking order as per the Constitution Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of ***S.N. Mukherjee Vs. Union of India, (1990) 4 SCC 594.***

3. This writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of with the consent order that the present writ petition will be treated as a representation to the respondent no. 1/School and the respondent no. 1/School after giving personal hearing to the petitioner or her nominee within a period of four weeks from today will pass a speaking order within six weeks thereafter giving reasons in accordance with the ratio of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of ***S.N. Mukherjee (supra).***

4. The speaking order will be communicated to the petitioner and if the petitioner is not satisfied the petitioner will have right in

accordance with law to file appropriate independent proceedings.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

NOVEMBER 21, 2016

AK