

\$~10

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

+ W.P.(C) 1069/2020

VIDYASHAKTI SHIKSHAN PRASARAK MANDAL KOLSA, TQ.
SENGAON AND ANR. Petitioners

Through: Mr. Aditya P.Khanna, Nicholas
Chaudhary, Advocates

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, SC with Ms.
Niharika Rai, Mr. Shivam Singh and
Mr. Jaideep Khanna, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **06.02.2020**

1. The contention of Ms. Dwivedi is that while the application filed by the petitioners in this case will be processed, it would have to be ascertained as to whether the fee, which was paid by the petitioners in the first instance, has actually been refunded to the petitioners.

1.1. I may note that Mr. Khanna, who appears on behalf of the petitioners, submits that the petitioners have not been refunded the fee.

1.2 Ms. Dwivedi, on the other hand, submits that the same stands refunded to the petitioners.

2. Thus, the petitioner's application will be processed in line with directions issued via the order dated 08.01.2020 in W.P.(C) 12307/2019, titled *Shri Vinayak Mahavidyalay v. National Council*

W.P.(C) 1069/2020

page 1 of 2

For Teacher Education And Anr.

3. It is made clear that in case, the fee has been refunded to the petitioners, they will have liberty to transmit the same to the respondent within one week of such communication being received.
4. If no such communication is received by the petitioners, it will be presumed that the fee paid by the petitioners is available with the respondent.
5. The directions contained in the aforementioned judgment will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioners as well.
6. The writ petition is disposed of in the abovesaid terms.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 06, 2020

Hk/VKR

W.P.(C) 1069/2020

page 2 of 2