

\$~14

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 3332/2017 and CM No.14546/2017**
LIFE CENTRE ACADEMY

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Anshumaan Sahni and Mr Aman
Bhalla, Advs

versus

**DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION, GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI &
ORS**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Anuj Aggarwal, ASG, GNCTD
with Ms Deboshree Mukherjee, Adv
and Mr D.S. Kanwar, Officer, DEO

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER
18.09.2017

%

By way of this writ petition the petitioner is seeking quashing of the letter dated 14.03.2017 issued by the respondent. The case of the petitioner is that it is running its school at 252, Satya Niketan, Moti Bagh – II, New Delhi – 21 on a plot of size 84 sq. mtrs from the year 1997. On 26.03.2013 the petitioner school had made an application to the respondent seeking recognition of its school; this was up to the primary level. This request of the petitioner got rejected on 10.12.2013. The objection was that the school did not conform to the minimum land norms of 200 sq. yds. A revision petition was filed against the aforementioned order. It was dismissed on 20.10.2014. The appeal filed against the aforementioned order was disposed of on

16.12.2015 with the following directions:-

“I, therefore, set-aside the impugned order. The Director (Education) shall take steps to grant recognition to the Appellant School up to Primary level, subject to inspection of new land acquired by the Appellant.”

This order of the learned LG while setting aside the impugned order had granted permission to the respondent to take steps to grant recognition to the petitioner school (up to primary level) subject to inspection of the new land acquired by the petitioner. New inspection of the school premises was carried out on 05.05.2016 but a copy of the inspection report was not furnished to the petitioner. On 14.03.2017 (order impugned) the petitioner was shocked to know that the Department had taken a frivolous objection in not granting recognition to the petitioner school and had asked the petitioner school to apply afresh.

The counter affidavit filed by the respondent is based on the same submissions. Learned counsel for the respondent, under instructions, submits that they would in fact have no objection to grant a recognition to the petitioner school (up to primary level) in case the petitioner applies afresh. Learned counsel for the petitioner, under instructions, states that he has no objection to apply afresh in the same form which he had filled up while applying in March 2013. Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that he had applied in Form 1-C and this is also recorded in the order dated 10.12.2013 of the respondent.

He will now accordingly apply in the same form i.e., Form 1-C. Respondent shall consider the application of the petitioner and after inspection of the property will pass an appropriate order within an outer limit of 8 weeks from today.

Petitioner disposed of.

Dasti under the signatures of the Court Master.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

SEPTEMBER 18, 2017
SU