

\$~20

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4626/2018 & C.M.Nos.17849-50/2018**

SANJEEV SINGLA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.S.P.Pandey, Adv. for
Mr.N.K.Upadhyay, Adv.

versus

THE PRINCIPAL, SHAH INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Pramod Gupta with Ms.Khushboo
Aggarwal, Adv for R-1.

Mr.Anupam Srivastava, ASC with Mr.Dhairya
Gupta, Adv for R-2 to 4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

% **14.05.2018**

Vide the present petition, the petitioner has sought a direction to the respondents for admitting his ward in the respondent no.1/school.

On the last date, the grievance raised by learned counsel for the petitioner was limited to the extent that the respondent no.1 was not accepting the food security card instead of income certificate as submitted by the petitioner for admission under EWS category.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record copy of the circular dated 18.06.2016 issued by respondent no.2 in support of his contention that as per directions issued by the said respondent, the food security card is to be treated as valid proof and benefit of EWS can be extended on basis of the food security card also.

At this stage, Mr. Pramod Gupta, learned counsel for the

respondent no.1 submits that even though the respondents are bound to accept the food security card for considering admission under EWS category, their own prima facie verifications have shown that the petitioner does not belong to the EWS category.

Mr.Gupta submits that the respondent no.1 may be granted liberty to approach the respondent no.2 to carry out the necessary verifications with respect to the petitioner's eligibility to seek admission under the EWS category and then give appropriate directions to respondent no.1.

Learned counsel for the respondent no.2 submits that upon the respondent no.1 making the aforesaid application, the respondent no.2 will carry out the necessary verifications after giving an opportunity of hearing to both the petitioner and the respondent no.1 and thereafter pass an appropriate order within four weeks from today.

In view of the aforesaid stand taken by learned counsels for respondent nos. 1 and 2, learned counsel for the petitioner does not wish to press the petition. He, however, prays for liberty to challenge the order, passed by respondent nos.1/2, if the need so arises.

The present petition alongwith pending applications stands dismissed as not pressed, with liberty as prayed for.

REKHA PALLI, J

MAY 14, 2018

sr