

**CWP-12418-2024****-1-****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****(116)****CWP-12418-2024****Date of decision: - 24.05.2024****The Delhi Public School****....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL****Present:- Mr. K.D.S. Hooda, Advocate, for the petitioner.****Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.***********VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to exempt the petitioner-school from Rule 158 of the Haryana School Education Rules, 2003 allowing the petitioner-school to fill up Form-VI with increased fee in the present academic session to stabilize the financial condition of the school.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation dated 24.04.2024 (Annexure P-8) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, respondent No.2 considers the said representation sympathetically, in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

**CWP-12418-2024****-2-**

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents-State has submitted that respondent No.2 would consider the said representation dated 24.04.2024 (Annexure P-8), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of eight weeks from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the representation dated 24.04.2024 (Annexure P-8) filed by the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case, respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible. In case, respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of eight weeks.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

May 24, 2024*naresh.k***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No