

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

C.W.P.No.24663 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: November 16, 2018

Progressive Private Schools Association

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

Present: Mr. Bharat Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J.

CM No.15865 of 2018 in CM No.7876 of 2018

For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is supported by an affidavit, the order dated 28.09.2018 dismissing CM No.7876 of 2018 is recalled and the application is restored to original original number.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No.7876 of 2018

For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is supported by an affidavit, order dated 27.11.2017 is recalled and the writ petition is restored to its original number.

CM stands disposed of.

CWP No.24663 of 2017

The petitioner, alleged to be a registered Society with the aim

and object to take up all formal and non-formal programmers, have sought the indulgence of this Court for issuance of direction to respondent Nos. 1,2,4 and 5 for withdrawing the permanent recognition granted to Rao Pahlad Senior Secondary School, Khatod, District Mahendergarh alleging certain violation of rules by adopting certain malpractices.

It has been averred that respondent No.6 is alleged to be running five schools described in Para 2 of the petition, but have no recognition and affiliation from the Central Board of School Education for Narnaul and Hansi, yet the students have been admitted and similarly in District Mahendergarh. An attempt has been made to substantiate the aforementioned fact by annexing few fee receipts Annexures P-2 to P-4. Erection of building without approval of site plan has also been alleged.

Challenge has also been laid to the permanent recognition dated 28.06.2016 (Annexure P-7) accorded by Government of Haryana, Directorate School Education and in this regard, a complaint to the offices of the Prime Minister and Chief Minister has been made. It has been alleged that the complaint marked to the Chief Minister was forwarded to respondent Nos.1 to 5, which has been disposed of in view of the reply received from respondent No.6.

In our opinion, the alleged grievance espoused in the present writ petition cannot be addressed in the manner and mode as sought, for, the locus standi of the petitioner has not been established, much less the decision rendered by respondent Nos.1 to 5 in response to the alleged complaint. It apparently appears to be an attempt to settle some personal score with respondent No.6 or at the instance of certain other educational institutions having competition. The Court exercises restraint in entertaining

such writ petitions as the same do not satisfy the tests for judicial intervention. The writ petition is, thus, bereft of any merits. Resultantly, the same is dismissed.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

November 16, 2018

ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No