

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

CWP No.23655 of 2019

Date of Decision: 05.03.2020

Ajit

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Ms.Neha Rana, Advocate, for
Mr.Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Harkesh Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr.Rajesh K. Sheoran, Advocate,
for respondent Nos.4 to 6.

* * * *

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The children of the petitioner were studying in Arya School Digawa Mandi. On 28th May, 2019, his daughter, who was a student of 10+2 class was allegedly molested by a teacher of the school resulting in registration of an FIR No.79 dated 27th June, 2019. The son of the petitioner was studying in 6th class at that pointed time. Allegedly, on account of registration of said FIR, the children of the petitioner were removed from the rolls of the school. An application dated 29th July, 2019, was submitted before respondent No.3 complaining against the action of the school but allegedly, no action was taken thereupon. Hence, the present writ petition was filed.

Learned counsel for respondent Nos.4 to 6 submits that in the

written statement filed on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3, it has been averred that representation dated 29th July, 2019, was not received by respondent No.3 and the said averment has not been controverted. Yet, on the oral complaint of the petitioner, an enquiry dated 19th August, 2019, was conducted by respondent No.3 and other officials and the recommendation of the said inquiry was that the children of the petitioner should be transferred to another school. Thereafter, the petitioner sought transfer of his children and issuance of School Leaving Certificates, which were accordingly issued. The children of the petitioner are currently studying in another school and no further action is called for. He further submits that the petitioner and his wife were not employed on a permanent basis. They used to work on a part time basis, as and when required. Thus, it is incorrect to suggest that their services have been terminated on account of registration of an FIR against a school teacher.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has nothing to say to controvert the submissions of learned counsel for respondent Nos.4 to 6.

Thus, no further orders are called for.

The writ petition is disposed of.

5th March, 2020
P.Seth

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

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