

\$~

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

15

+ **LPA 666/2018**

MATA GUJRI PUBLIC SCHOOL

..... Appellant

Through: None.

versus

NARINDER KAUR & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Respondent No.1 present in person.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

06.02.2019

1. None appears for the Appellant.
2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 29th November, 2018, the following order was passed by this Court:

“CM 49809/2018 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CM 49808/2018 (stay)

2. Having heard the learned counsel of the Appellant, the Court is not inclined to grant any interim relief at this stage. The application is dismissed.

LPA 666/2018

3. This Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order dated 16th November, 2018 passed by the learned Single Judge dismissing the Appellant's writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 12234/2018 on merits.

4. Learned counsel for the Appellant submitted that the Respondent No. 1 has only two years of service and that there is no vacancy in the school at present to accommodate

her pursuant to the impugned order of the learned Single Judge

5. The Court makes it clear that the order of the learned Single Judge should be complied with by the Appellant by putting the Respondent No. 1 back on the rolls, even if she not able to be allotted any specific duty. Nevertheless, in view of the statement by learned counsel for the Appellant that the Appellant is ready for an amicable settlement of the disputes with the Respondent No.1, notice is issued to the Respondent No.1 limited to this purpose, subject further to the Appellant depositing Rs. 15,000/- towards the costs of litigation of Respondent No.1 in the Court within two weeks from today, which amount will be released to her as soon as she enters appearance.

6. Subject to compliance with the above directions, notice be issued to the Respondent No. 1 alone, to explore the possibility of settlement.

7. List on 6th February, 2019.”

3. Today Respondent No.1 appears in person and is categorical that no settlement is possible.

4. In that view of the matter, the appeal is dismissed.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

SANJEEV NARULA, J.

FEBRUARY 06, 2019

rd