

CWP No.12333 of 2015 (O&M)

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

Date of Decision : 22.12.2017

1) 382-1

CWP No.12333 of 2015(O&M)

Moonlight High School, Village Silama and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

2) 382-2

CWP No.5706 of 2015 (O&M)

Shivam and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

3) 382-3

CWP No.6489 of 2015 (O&M)

Bhawna and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

4) 382-4

CWP No.19342 of 2016 (O&M)

Rajender

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CWP No.12333 of 2015 (O&M)

2

5) 382-5

CWP No.6466 of 2016 (O&M)

Anwar Khan

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. R.S.Bains, Advocate
for the petitioners (CWP No.12333 of 2015).

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner (s). (CWP No.5706, 6489 of 2015)
and CWP No.19342 of 2016).

Mr. Nipun Vashisht, Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP No.6466 of 2016).

Dr. Sushil Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. K.K.Gupta, Advocate
for respondent-District Education Board
(CWP Nos.5706 and 6489 of 2015)
CWP Nos.6466 & 19342 of 2016).

Mr. Harbahajan Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondent No.4-UOI (CWP No.19342 of 2016).

Mr. Abhay Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Amar Vivek, Advocate
for respondent No.2 (CWP No.12333 of 2015).

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of above mentioned five writ petitions.

CWP No.19342 of 2016 has been filed for a direction to the
respondent No.2-Haryana School Education Board to issue the Detailed
Marks Certificate (DMC) to the petitioner under the Haryana Open School

CWP No.12333 of 2015 (O&M)

Board and for quashing the impugned action of the respondents for cancelling the result of class 10 of the petitioner.

CWP No.5706 of 2015 has been filed by 28 minors praying for a direction to the respondent No.2-Haryana School Education Board not to cancel the detailed marksheet issued to them under the Haryana Open Board School Bhiwani. Their further relief claimed is to permit the petitioners No.11, 16, 19, 27 and 28 to take the re-appear/compartament examination of the 10th Class of the Haryana Open Board School. In this petition originally a limited prayer had been made on the date when the case had come up for motion hearing. Notice had been issued only qua that limited relief and for only petitioners No.11, 16, 19, 27 and 28.

Notice of motion is today issued to the respondents qua the other petitioners and the other reliefs also. On the asking of the Court, Mr.K.K.Gupta, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2-Haryana School Education Board and further states that this is a group of five cases which have some common points and he further states that the written statement filed in this case actually contains a reply to all the writ petitions and all the issues. On going through the written statement I find that this is indeed so.

CWP No.6466 of 2016 has been filed by one student by which he has challenged the order cancelling his result of class 10th under the Haryana Open School, District Mewat. CWP No.6489 of 2015 has been filed to allow the petitioners to take the compartment/reappear exam of the 10th class under the Haryana Open School Board and then to declare their results. CWP No.12333 of 2015 has been filed by 8 schools whereby they have also challenged the order by which the 10th class result of some of their

CWP No.12333 of 2015 (O&M)

students who had taken the 10th class examination of the Haryana Open School Board as well as for an order quashing the direction given to them by the respondent No.2-Board of School Education, Haryana, Bhiwani to lodge an FIR against some of their students.

In the academic session 2013-2014 some students had got admissions in some schools in class 10th. For taking this admission they had submitted school leaving certificates which showed that they had passed the class 9th examination from various other schools outside the State of Haryana. During that time the respondent-Board of School Education Haryana entertained doubts about the validity and correctness of some of those school leaving certificates. When they took admission they were enrolled with the Haryana School Education Board provisionally subject to verification of their previous school leaving certificates and other documents. At that time all the schools where they had taken admission gave an undertaking to the Board that they had checked the school leaving certificates/transfer certificates of all such students and in case it was later on discovered that these school leaving certificates/transfer certificates were fake the schools would be responsible. After that they took the 10th class examination. The Board later found out that the school leaving certificates and transfer certificates were bogus. When the schools came to know that the candidature of many of their students was going to be cancelled in view of this finding they approached the Board and requested the Board to consider the students under the Open School examination because as per the regulations governing the Haryana Open School Board the only requirement to sit in the 10th class examination was that the examinee should be 14 years of age. It was represented that even if the students were not entitled to take

CWP No.12333 of 2015 (O&M)

5

the examination as regular candidates they would definitely be entitled to take the examination as Haryana Open School Board candidates since they satisfied the requirements of the Haryana Open School Board. On that representation the Chairman of the Board ordered that in case the fees/late fees/additional fees etc. of the Haryana Open School Board is deposited, the results of the students be provisionally declared under the Haryana Open School Board subject to the approval of the Board. Later when the matter came before the Board it was decided that the concession given by the Chairman was incorrect and that the only legal action which could be taken would be to cancel the candidature of the students altogether and cancel their results under Regulation 61 (A) (iii) of the Matriculation Examination Regulation of the Board. This decision was taken in May 2015 after one year. Once that happened those students who had otherwise failed in one or two subjects and had deposited the fees for the compartment examination also became dis-entitled to take that compartment examination and it was at that stage that these petitions were filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners-students have argued that once they were permitted to shift to the Open school on payment of substantial extra fees, they had altered their position to their detriment on the representation of the respondent and the respondent would be now estopped from cancelling their result. Learned counsel for the petitioners have argued that there is no dispute that the students were all eligible to take the 10th class examination of the Haryana Open School Board because they were all more than 14 years of age and this was the only eligibility condition of the Haryana Open School Board. Learned counsel for the petitioners have argued that in this case the petitioners-students had taken admission in

CWP No.12333 of 2015 (O&M)

the academic session 2013-2014. Within 15 days of the admissions the schools had forwarded their particulars to the respondent-Board. The Board took this action in the year 2015 almost one year after the result had been declared.

On the other hand the argument of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Board is that once the admission had been obtained on false pretenses and it was discovered that the school leaving certificates/transfer certificates were fake and bogus the Board had rightly decided to cancel whatever illegal benefit which such students had obtained.

Learned counsel for the respondent No.2-Mr.Abhay Gupta, Advocate has relied on “**Ram Preeti Yadav Vs. U.P.Board of High School and Intermediate Education and others, 2003, 8 SCC 311**” wherein the Supreme Court held as follows:-

“1. In the year 1984, respondent No. 3 herein Mahendra Pratap Yadav appeared as a private candidate in the Intermediate Examination conducted by U.P. Board of High School & Intermediate Education from Janta Inter College, Azamgarh (U.P.). When the results of Intermediate Examination of the year 1984 were declared, the result of respondent No. 3 was shown as withheld as a suspected case of using unfair means. He was issued a provisional mark- sheet without showing that his result for Intermediate Examination has been withheld. It is really surprising that such a mark-sheet was issued to the respondent No. 3 by the Principal of the College inasmuch as his result was admittedly directed to be withheld by respondent No. 1. Curiously enough, in another provisional marks-sheet which was issued on or about 1.9.1986 by the Principal of the College the word "W.B." i.e. result withheld finds place. It also stands admitted that the respondent No. 3 did not apply for nor was given any final

marks-sheet nor any certificate of passing the examination. It appears that on the basis of the provisional marks-sheet respondent No. 3 took his admission in B. A. without disclosing the fact that his result has been withheld and passed the B.A. Examination as well as M.A. Examination. Subsequently, he also got employment as a Teacher in Mathura Inter College, Naharpur, Distt. Azamgarh. It appears that in the year 1993 some inquiry was made as regards the passing of the Intermediate Examination by respondent No. 3. The inquiry continued for some time and it is under such circumstances the Principal of Janata Inter College informed respondent No. 3 on 16.10.1996 that his result of Intermediate Examination of the year 1984 was cancelled.

2. *It is at this stage respondent No. 3 filed a petition under [Article 226](#) of the Constitution challenging cancellation of his result of Intermediate Examination of the year 1984, inter alia, on the ground (i) that he was not afforded any opportunity of hearing before cancellation of his Examination;*

(ii) that the cancellation after more than 10 years was wholly arbitrary and illegal; and (iii) that he having passed the B.A. and M.A. Examinations had secured appointment as a Teacher in the College and as such equity demands that the order cancelling the result of his Intermediate Examination of the year 1984 be set aside. A learned Single Judge of the Allahabad High Court was of the view that in the instant case if the result of respondent No. 3 herein of Intermediate Examination is allowed to be shown as cancelled his career would be ruined and since he had passed the High School Examination in First Division, B.A. Examination in Second Division and M.A. examination in First Division and by and large his academic career is brilliant, the cancellation of his result is unreasonable. Consequently, the writ petition was allowed and order of cancellation of result of Intermediate Examination was set aside. Aggrieved, the appellant who is a

colleague of respondent No. 3 and is working in the same Institution wherein respondent No. 3 is working as well as the Board of High School and Intermediate Education filed special appeals before a Division Bench of the High Court. The Division Bench summarily dismissed the appeals. It is against the said judgment and order, the appellant is in appeal before us.”

The Supreme Court further held as follows:-

“13. Fraud is a conduct either by letter or words, which induces the other person, or authority to take a definite determinative stand as a response to the conduct of former either by words or letter. Although negligence is not fraud but it can be evidence on fraud. (See Deny v. Peek).

14. In Lazarus Estate v. Berly, (1956) 1 All ER 341 the Court of Appeal stated the law thus :

"I cannot accede to this argument for a moment "no Court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. No judgment of a Court, no order of a Minister, can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by fraud. Fraud unravels everything". The Court is careful not to find fraud unless it is distinctly pleaded and proved; but once it is proved it vitiates judgments, contracts and all transactions whatsoever."

15. In S.P. Chengalvaraya Naidu v. Jagannath, [1994] 1 SCC 1, this Court stated that fraud avoids all judicial acts, ecclesiastical or temporal.

26 Further, we find that there is no equity in favour of respondent No. 3, inasmuch as he knew that his result has been withheld because of the allegation of having used unfair means in the Examination. Suppressing this fact, he took admission in B.A. and studied further.

27. We are, therefore, of the view that the High Court committed error in allowing the writ petition filed by

respondent. No. 3. Consequently, the order under challenge and that of the learned Single Judge, are set aside. The appeal is allowed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Another judgment which has been relied upon by Mr. K.K.Gupta, Advocate is “**Chairman and Managing Director FCI and ors. Vs. Jagdish Balaram Bahira and ors, 2017 (3) SCT 735**, wherein it was held as follows:-

3. The framers of the Constitution conceived of a policy of affirmative action to redress the social exclusion, economic deprivation and political alienation suffered by historically disadvantaged classes of Indian society. Reservation of posts in public employment and seats for admission in educational institutions and the setting apart of seats in electoral bodies was envisaged by the Constitution for the fulfilment of a constitutional aspiration of social justice to the Scheduled Castes and Tribes and to socially and educationally backward classes of citizens. In pursuit of the constitutional goal of substantive equality, reservations have been envisaged as a means of enabling members of beneficiary groups to realise, in a true sense, dignity, freedom and liberty which the Constitution guarantees as its basic philosophy. But the problem which has confronted legislatures, policy makers as well as courts (as enforcers of the rule of law) is a capture of the benefits of affirmative action programmes by persons who do not genuinely belong to the beneficiary groups. This kind of capture poses a serious dimension. When a person who does not belong to a caste, tribe or class for whom reservation is meant, seeks to pass off as its member, such a stratagem constitutes a fraud on the Constitution. For one thing a person who is disentitled to the benefit of a welfare measure obtains the benefit. For another this deprives a beneficiary who is

genuinely entitled to receive those benefits of a legitimate entitlement. This constitutes an egregious constitutional fraud. It is a fraud on the statutes which implement the provisions of the Constitution. It is a fraud on state policy. Confronted with this problem, the legislatures have intervened with statutory instruments while the executive has, in implementation of law, set down administrative parameters and guidelines to prevent the usurpation of benefits.

4 The batch of cases with which the court is confronted involves individuals who sought the benefit of public employment on the basis of a claim to belong to a beneficiary group which has, upon investigation been found to be invalid. Despite the invalidation of the claim to belong to a Scheduled Caste or, as the case may be, a Scheduled Tribe or backward community, the intervention of the Court is invoked in the exercise of the power of judicial review. The basis for the invocation of jurisdiction lies in an assertion that equities arise upon a lapse of time and these equities are capable of being protected either by the High Court (in the exercise of its jurisdiction under [Article 226](#)) or by this Court (when it discharges the constitutional function of doing complete justice under Article 142). The present batch of cases then raises the fundamental issue as to whether such equities are sustainable at law and, if so, the limits that define the jurisdiction of the court to protect individuals who have secured access to the benefit of reservation in spite of the fact that they do not belong to the caste, tribe or class for whom reservation is intended.

56. Medical education is what middle-class parents across the length and breadth of the county aspire for their children (whether this will continue to be so in future is a moot question). There is intense competition for a limited number of under-graduate, post-graduate and super-speciality seats. This can furnish no justification for recourse to unfair means

including adopting a false claim to belong to the reserved category. The fault – lines of our system, be it in education, health or law, are that its lethargy and indolence furnish incentives for the few who choose to break the rules to gain an unfair advantage. In such a situation, the court as a vital institution of democratic governance must be firm in sending out a principled message that there is no incentive other than for behaviour compliant with rules and deviance will meet severe reprimands of the law.

57 . *For these reasons, we hold and declare that*

(i) The directions which were issued by the Constitution Bench of this Court in paragraph 38 of the decision in Milind were in pursuance of the powers vested in this Court under [Article 142](#) of the Constitution;

(ii) Since the decision of this Court in Madhuri Patil which was rendered on 2 September 1994, the regime which held the field in pursuance of those directions envisaged a detailed procedure for (a) the issuance of caste certificates; (b) scrutiny and verification of caste and tribe claims by Scrutiny Committees to be constituted by the State Government; (c) the procedure for the conduct of investigation into the authenticity of the claim; (d) Cancellation and confiscation of the caste certificate where the claim is found to be false or not genuine; (e) Withdrawal of benefits in terms of the termination of an appointment, cancellation of an admission to an educational institution or disqualification from an electoral office obtained on the basis that the candidate belongs to a reserved category; and (f) Prosecution for a criminal offence;

(iii) The decisions of this Court in R. Vishwanatha Pillai and in Dattatray which were rendered by benches of three Judges laid down the principle of law that where a benefit is secured by an individual – such as an appointment to a post or admission to an educational institution – on the basis that the candidate belongs to a reserved category for which the benefit is

reserved, the invalidation of the caste or tribe claim upon verification would result in the appointment or, as the case may be, the admission being rendered void or non est.

(iv) The exception to the above doctrine was in those cases where this Court exercised its power under [Article 142](#) of the Constitution to render complete justice;

(v) By Maharashtra Act XXIII of 2001 there is a legislative codification of the broad principles enunciated in Madhuri Patil. The legislation provides a statutory framework for regulating the issuance of caste certificates ([Section 4](#)); constitution of Scrutiny Committees for verification of claims ([Section 6](#)); submission of applications for verification of caste certificates ([Section 6\(2\)](#) and [6\(3\)](#)); cancellation of caste certificates ([Section 7](#)); burden of proof ([Section 8](#)); withdrawal of benefits obtained upon the invalidation of the claim ([Section 10](#)); and initiation of prosecution ([Section 11](#)), amongst other things;

(vi) The power conferred by [Section 7](#) upon the Scrutiny Committee to verify a claim is both in respect of caste certificates issued prior to and subsequent to the enforcement of the Act on 18 October 2001. Finality does not attach to a caste certificate (or to the claim to receive benefits) where the claim of the individual to belong to a reserved caste, tribe or class is yet to be verified by the Scrutiny Committee;

(vii) Withdrawal of benefits secured on the basis of a caste claim which has been found to be false and is invalidated is a necessary consequence which flows from the invalidation of the caste claim and no issue of retrospectivity would arise;

(viii) The decisions in Kavita Solunke and Shalini of two learned Judges are overruled. Shalini in so far as it stipulates a requirement of a dishonest intent for the application of the provision of [Section 10](#) is, with respect, erroneous and does not reflect the correct position in law;

(ix) Mens rea is an ingredient of the penal provisions

contained in Section 11. [Section 11](#) is prospective and would apply in those situations where the act constituting the offence has taken place after the date of its enforcement;

(x) The judgment of the Full Bench of the Bombay High Court in Arun Sonone is manifestly erroneous and is overruled; and

(xi) Though the power of the Supreme Court under [Article 142](#) of the Constitution is a constitutional power vested in the court for rendering complete justice and is a power which is couched in wide terms, the exercise of the jurisdiction must have due regard to legislative mandate, where a law such as Maharashtra Act XXIII of 2001 holds the field.

Reliance is also been placed on “***Kumari Madhuri Patil and another Vs. Additional Commissioner, Tribal Development and others, 1994 (6) SCC 241***”, in that case the issue was that certain students had got admission in the BDS course on false representation regarding their caste. The Supreme Court has held as follows:-

16. Whether appellants are entitled to their further continuance in the studies is the further question. Often the plea of equities or promissory estoppel would be put forth for continuance and completion of further course of studies and usually would be found favour with the courts. The courts have constitutional duty and responsibility, in exercise of the power of its judicial review, to see that constitutional goals set down in the Preamble, the Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles of the Constitution, are achieved. A party that seeks equity, must come with clean hands. He who comes to the court with false claim, cannot plead equity nor the court would be justified to exercise equity jurisdiction in his favour. There is no estoppel as no promise of the social status is made by the State when a false plea was put forth for the social status

recognised and declared by the Presidential Order under the Constitution as amended by the SC & ST (Amendment) Act, 1976, which is later found to be false. Therefore, the plea of promissory estoppel or equity have no application. When it is found to be a case of fraud played by the concerned, no sympathy and equitable considerations can come to his rescue. Nor the plea of estoppel is germane to the beneficial constitutional concessions and opportunities given to the genuine tribes or castes. Courts would be circumspect and vary in considering such cases.”

He has further relied upon ***Regional Manager, Central Bank of India Vs. Madhulika Guruprasad Dahir & Ors., 2008 (13) SCC 170*** in which case also a person had obtained public employment against reserved post by producing false caste certificate. The Supreme Court held as follows :-

“16.Having considered the matter in the light of the afore- stated legal position, in our judgment, the decision of the High Court is untenable. As noted supra, the employee having accepted the finding of the Scrutiny Committee, holding that the caste certificate furnished by the employee was false, the very foundation of her appointment vanished and her (2007) 1 SCC 80 appointment was rendered illegal. Her conduct renders her unfit to be continued in service and must necessarily entail termination of her service. Under these circumstances, there is absolutely no justification for her claim in respect of the post merely on the ground that she had worked on the post for over twenty years. The post was meant for a reserved candidate but she usurped the same by misrepresentation and deception. In our opinion, the fact that caste certificate was referred to the Scrutiny Committee for verification after ten years of her joining the service and a long time was taken by the Scrutiny Committee to verify the same is

of no consequence inasmuch as delay on both the counts does not validate the caste certificate and the consequent illegal appointment.

17. *We are also unable to persuade ourselves to agree with learned counsel for the employee that in the absence of any finding of fraud having been played by the employee, the order of the High Court is equitable and should not be interfered with. As noted above, the selection of the employee was conceived in deceit and, therefore, could not be saved by equitable considerations.*

18. *In view of the foregoing discussion, the impugned judgment and order quashing the order of termination of service of the employee and directing her reinstatement cannot be sustained. The order of termination based on the report of the Scrutiny Committee does not suffer from any infirmity and the High Court should not have interfered with the same.”*

Reacting to the judgments cited by the counsel for the respondents, counsel for the petitioners point out that in all the cases except ***Ram Preeti Yadav*** (supra) the action was taken after the notice was issued to the concerned person and in the case of ***Ram Preeti Yadav*** (supra) the Supreme Court had held that since the only provisional result had been declared the candidate should have followed up and therefore held that no notice was required. Counsel for the petitioner-students have also pointed out that even as per the Board they have issued show cause notices to the schools before taking further action against them. Learned counsel further asserted that the judgments cited by the respondents in the cases of ***Central Bank of India*** (supra) and ***FCI and others*** (supra) related to public employment and the only case which related to admission was that of ***Kumari Madhuri Patil*** (supra). In the Judgment of ***Kumari Madhuri Patil***

(supra) they have drawn the attention of the Court to paragraph Nos. 17 to 19 which are quoted here in below:-

“17. We have seen that Miss Suchita rightly made an application before the competent officer within whose jurisdiction her father lives in Muland and when he refused to give the certificate, she filed an appeal; approached the High Court and obtained direction and gained admission. It is not in dispute that the Additional Commissioner was delaying it; he did not decide as directed by the High Court, instead directed the Tahsildar to issue the certificate. Thus she secured a false social status certificate and orders of the court were used to gain admission. The judicial process is made use of to secure admission. She continued her studies thereafter pending scrutiny of her status certificate. No doubt there was a delay on the part of the Scrutiny Committee in the disposal of the claims and we do not find any record to scan the reasons for the delay. Suffice to state that her parents have put her under a cloud as to her social status. But as seen from the facts a course of conduct was adopted by her parents to gain admission on the claim which is now found to be false. Parents' misconduct visits the children also many a times. However, she has now completed the course of study except to appear for the final year as contended for her and nothing more is to be done in the situation for her to complete her course of study. We direct the Principal to permit her to sit for the final year examination, if she has completed the course of study as represented to us but not with the social status as a Scheduled Tribe which was claimed fraudulently and made her admission with the aid of the court's order and continue her studies. The delay in disposal facilitated her continuance in study of MBBS course.

18. The delay in the process is inevitable but that factor should neither be considered to be relevant nor be an aid to complete the course of study. But for the fact that she has completed the entire course except to appear for the final examination, we would have directed to debar her from prosecuting the studies and appearing in

the examination. In this factual situation no useful purpose would be served to debar her from appearing for the examination of final year MBBS. Therefore, we uphold the cancellation of the social status as Mahadeo Koli fraudulently obtained by Km Suchita Laxman Patil, but she be allowed to appear for the final year examination of MBBS course. She will not, however be entitled in future for any benefits on the basis of the fraudulent social status as Mahadeo Koli. However, this direction should not be treated and used as a precedent in future cases to give any similar directions since the same defeats constitutional goals.

19. In the case of Madhuri Laxman Patil, she did not approach the competent officer. She appears to have wrongly gone to an officer who had no jurisdiction, obviously she has shown the order issued by the High Court in favour of her sister Suchita and secured the certificate and got the admission. Though she is in midway of her study in BDS in the end of second year, she cannot continue her studies with her social status as Mahadeo Koli, a Scheduled Tribe and the concessions which she might have got on that account. If she was eligible for obtaining admission as a general candidate she may continue her studies. Therefore, we uphold the cancellation and confiscation of her and of Suchita of social status as Mahadeo Koli ordered by Scrutiny Committee and affirmed by the order of Appellate Authority and that of the High Court in that behalf. Subject to the above modifications, the appeal is dismissed but without costs.”

In my considered opinion, this case will have to be decided on two planes. On the one hand is the claim of the students and on the other hand is the petition filed by the schools. As regards the students it would be seen that all of them are minors. Moreover, it cannot also be lost sight of that once their forms were forwarded to the Board, if the Board had cancelled their admission within any reasonable time they would have been

CWP No.12333 of 2015 (O&M)

eligible to take admission in the Haryana Open School since, as mentioned above the eligibility requirement to take 10th class examination of Haryana Open School is only that a candidate should have attained the age of 14 years. On the contrary what the Board did after almost two years was to cancel their result which meant that they would lose two years. The petitioners lost their chance to independently apply under the Haryana Open School Board and to take the exam in 2014 or 2015 where the candidature qualification was 14 years of age. No doubt they would have lost their admission fee etc but their year would have been saved. Moreover, no notice was issued to them before cancelling their results. In the circumstances, the action of the Board in cancelling their result has to be set aside.

The petitions are disposed of in the above terms. Ordered accordingly.

As regards the schools, as far as the directions given to them to register FIR (on the pain of disaffiliation), the same has also to be set aside. However the Board would obviously be at liberty to take action against the schools if it comes to the conclusion that they knew about the submission of bogus certificates.

Since the main cases have been decided, the pending Civil Misc. Applications, if any, also stands disposed of.

(**AJAY TEWARI**)
JUDGE

22.12.2017

Pooja sharma-I/anuradha

Whether speaking/reasoned	-	Yes/No
Whether reportable	-	Yes/No