



\$~104

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

+ W.P.(C) 6822/2025

RAVI CHANDER JHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

DELHI TAMIL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Ms. Chandrika Sachdev and Mr. Dhruv Kumar, Advs. for GNCTD/DoE.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **20.05.2025**

CM APPL. 30957/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 6822/2025

3. The present petition has been filed seeking following relief:

“A. Relief Against the School (Delhi Tamil Education Association Senior Secondary School, Pusa Road)

1. Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing Respondent No. 1 along with all Government aided linguistic minority school to:

- *Provide a clear and reasoned response regarding the admission status of Vedika Jha for the academic session 2024-25.*



- *Disclose the complete admission process, including the criteria, merit list, number of seats, and selection of non-minority candidates in a transparent manner.*
- *Comply with the provisions of the Right to Education Act, 2009, ensuring that non-minority candidates are not arbitrarily denied admission.*

2. Issue a Writ of Certiorari quashing any arbitrary denial of admission to Vedika Jha and directing her admission in Class 1 at Respondent No. 1, or in an alternative school in the neighborhood.

3. Direct Respondent No. 2 and Respondent No. 4 to take appropriate action against Respondent No. 1 for its arbitrary and opaque admission practices.

4. Order an independent investigation by the appropriate agency into allegations of donations and irregularities in the admission process at Delhi Tamil Education Association Senior Secondary School and other schools under its management, to ensure fair and lawful admissions in accordance with applicable laws.

B. Relief Against CPGRAMS (Public Grievance Redressal Mechanism)

1. Direct that grievances filed through CPGRAMS should not be closed merely by transferring them to another department without substantive resolution.

2. Provide a fixed maximum timeframe for transferring a grievance to ensure timely redressal.

3. Direct the implementation of a better and more effective appeal mechanism, ensuring that:

- *A fair hearing is conducted for both parties.*



- *The appeal process is transparent and accountable.*

4. *Take appropriate action against Respondent No. 3 (Department of School Education & Literacy) for unnecessarily delaying the complaint for one month before transferring it.*

5. *Take appropriate action against Respondent No. 2 (Director, Directorate of Education) for failing to respond to Grievance Reference No: DOSEL/E/2024/0001220 dated 05.03.2024 despite repeated follow-ups.*

C. Relief Against PGMS (Public Grievance Monitoring System)

1. *Provide a fixed maximum timeframe for transferring or closing grievances to prevent excessive delays.*

2. *Take appropriate action against Respondent No. 5 (Delhi Tamil Education Association, Lodhi Estate) and Respondent No. 4 (Deputy Director of Education, Zone 28) for unnecessarily delaying a complaint for six months before providing a response.*

3. *Direct the establishment of a better and more effective appeal mechanism, ensuring that:*

- *The complainant is given an opportunity to present their case.*
- *A hearing mechanism is instituted for grievance resolution.*

D. Relief Under RTI Act, 2005

1. *Direct Respondent No. 3 (Deputy Director, UT, Department of School Education & Literacy) to:*



- *Transfer the Petitioner's RTI application to the appropriate department of the Government of NCT of Delhi in accordance with Section 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.*
- *Process and respond to the transferred RTI application without requiring the Petitioner to reapply.*

2. Direct Respondent No. 1 (Delhi Tamil Education Association, Pusa Road) to:

- *Provide the required information sought in RTI Application No. EDUDH/R/2024/60666 without further delay.*
- *Furnish all necessary details regarding the admission process, number of seats, and selection criteria for non-minority candidates.*

3. Impose appropriate penalties on Respondent No. 1 and Respondent No. 4 for their non-compliance with the RTI Act, 2005, as per Section 20 of the Act.

E. Relief Against Directorate of Education (Edudel)

1. Direct Respondent No. 2 (Director, Directorate of Education) to:

- *Immediately address the grievance and take appropriate action regarding the admission of Vedika Jha for the academic session 2024-2025.*
- *Ensure compliance with the Right to Education Act, 2009, and uphold Vedika Jha's fundamental right to education.*
- *Furnish a detailed response on the status of the admission and the reasons for inaction.*

F. Relief Against National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR)



1. *Direct Respondent No. 4 (Deputy Director of Education, Zone 28) to immediately comply with the directions issued by the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR) and ensure the admission of Vedika Jha.*

2. *Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing Respondent No. 4 to:*

- *Take appropriate action against Respondent No. 1 for non-admission of non-minority candidates and lack of transparency.*
- *Provide an alternative school for Vedika Jha's admission if admission to Respondent No. 1 is not possible.*

G. Relief Against Delhi Tamil Education Association (DTEA)

1. *Acknowledge that while Delhi Tamil Education Association (DTEA) is a linguistic minority institution, it must still adhere to basic principles of fairness, transparency, and non-discrimination in admissions.*

2. *Direct DTEA to disclose:*

- *The total number of seats available in Class 1.*
- *The number of seats reserved for minority and non-minority candidates.*
- *The criteria followed for admission and selection process for non-minority candidates.*

3. *Ensure that DTEA maintains transparency in its admission process and does not arbitrarily reject non-minority candidates."*

4. Mr. Ravi Chander Jha, the petitioner appearing in-person, claims himself to be the uncle of child namely, Vedika Jha, who has been denied



admission by the respondent no.1 school.

5. A perusal of the memo of parties shows that neither the child nor any of her parents, is a party.
6. In view of the above, he seeks to withdraw the present petition with liberty to file afresh in the name of affected party.
7. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as aforesaid.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

MAY 20, 2025
N.S. ASWAL