

\$~74

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 9183/2016, CM APPL. 37140/2016, CM APPL. 37141/2016
ASHA RANI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mrs. Indrani Ghose and Ms. Nidhi
Jacob, Advs.

versus

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & ORS

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rakesh Tikku, Sr. Adv. with Ms.
Angel Bhardwaj and Mr. Hazil Bhardwaj, Advs.
for R-2, 3 & 4.
Ms. Sakshi Popli, Adv. for Department of
Education.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAJMI WAZIRI

% **ORDER**
05.10.2016

Mr. Rakesh Tikku, the learned Senior Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 to 4 appears on receipt of advance copy. He states that the writ petition is not maintainable in view of the prayers sought in it because the examination of the witnesses is underway in the inquiry proceedings and which are being held pursuant to the orders of this Court in writ petition No. 3525 of 2016. He states that an inquiry is being conducted against the petitioner under the Delhi School Education Rules.

In WP (C) 3525/2016, this Court on 30.05.2016 had directed the

respondents to expedite the inquiry proceedings against the petitioner and preferably conclude the same within two months from 01.08.2016. The said order had also allowed the petitioner to appear as a Defence Assistant apropos the other ten teachers before the Inquiry Officer.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charge-sheet runs into 300 pages and she wants some more time to complete the cross examination. On a specific query put to her, she submits that she requires approximately a month for leading her evidence.

Mr. Rakesh Tiku, the learned Senior Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 to 4 submits that only about four witnesses of the school remain to be examined and the evidence of the respondents can be completed within seven days. Let it be so done.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she will take about 25 days to complete her evidence and will make a similar request before the Inquiry Officer (E.O).

It is for the E.O. to consider such request when made and to conclude the proceedings as directed by the Court and as per law.

In view of the above, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that she does not wish to pursue the writ petition and seeks to withdraw the same without prejudice to her rights and contentions. The writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. This Court has expressed no view on the merits of the case.

NAJMI WAZIRI, J

OCTOBER 05, 2016/acm