



\$~190

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

+ W.P.(C) 109/2025
CHANDRA RANI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar Mittal, Mr. Yogesh Kumar, Ms. Bharti Kapil and Ms. Uma, Advocates alongwith
Petitioner in person.

versus

MANAGING COMMITTEE THROUGH ITS CHAIRMAN
SARDAR PATEL PUBLIC SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL
KARAWAL NAGAR DELHI 110090 & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Rishi Bharadwaj, Advocate for
R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER
08.01.2025

%

CM APPL. 424/2025 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 109/2025 & CM APPL. 425/2025 (for ad-interim ex-parte directions)

1. The petitioner has filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution against a charge sheet/memorandum dated 13.05.2024, by which seven articles of charge have been served upon her. The petitioner has responded to the articles of charge by a communication dated 19.09.2024.

2. It is the contention of the petitioner that she was not informed of



the appointment of an Inquiry Officer but has, after preparation of the writ petition, been served with a letter dated 30.12.2024 from an Inquiry Officer, who has signed as “*Vice Principal or Inquiry Officer*”. The letter states that he has been appointed as the Inquiry Officer in the respondent school to conduct an inquiry against the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner, instructed by the petitioner who is present in Court, states that the Inquiry Officer is not the Vice Principal of the respondent school. However, it is submitted that the Inquiry Officer has been appointed by the Disciplinary Action Committee of the School, which prejudices his independence.

3. This contention does not find place in the writ petition. In any event, the scope of interference at the stage of chargesheet is extremely limited, as laid down by the Supreme Court *inter alia* in *Union of India and Another vs. Kunisetty Satyanaryana*, (2006) 12 SCC 28, and *Secretary, Ministry of Defence vs. Prabhash Chandra Mirdha*, (2012) 11 SCC 565. Having regard to the law laid down therein, I do not find any reason to interfere with the disciplinary proceedings in the present case, at this stage. The rights and contentions of the petitioner are reserved for adjudication at the appropriate stage, if necessary.

4. The writ petition, alongwith the pending application, is disposed of with these observations.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 8, 2025/MR/JM/