



\$~111

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7285/2025 & CM APPL. 32811/2025**

MANISH KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikas, Advocate for R-1.

Ms. Shikha Sharma Bagga, Advocate for R-2/School.

Ms. Arti Bansal, ASC for R-3/DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

15.12.2025

%

1. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

“a. Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ in favour of the petitioner and against the respondents thereby directing the respondents especially respondent no.2/school to promote and continue to the ward of the petitioner namely baby Aradhya Singla D/o Sh. Manish Kumar upto secondary/senior secondary education under EWS/Freeship category.

b. Issue any other appropriate order or direction in favour of the petitioner and against the respondents thereby directing the respondent no.2/School to maintains. status quo under EWS/Freeship category.”

2. Case of the Petitioner as set out in the petition is that ward of the Petitioner was granted admission in Pre-Primary Class in Respondent No. 2/School under EWS/Freeship/DG category for the academic session 2015-2016 under the offline mode and was not being permitted to continue due to



fee issues.

3. On 26.05.2025, when the writ petition was taken up for admission, statement of counsel for the Petitioner was recorded that the ward of the Petitioner was declared successful in Class VIII examination held for the academic year 2024-2025 and had been promoted to Class IX, however, Respondent No. 2 was asking the Petitioner to make payment of school fee or else name of Petitioner's ward will be struck off. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 2 submitted that ward of the Petitioner was never admitted under the EWS category and admission was granted for the academic session 2016-2017 in the Management Quota and not for academic session 2015-2016.

4. Ms. Shikha Sharma Bagga, learned counsel for Respondent No. 2/School submits that the ward of the Petitioner is continuing to study in the School and no impediment will be created in further studies of the ward of the Petitioner.

5. None for the Petitioner.

6. In light of the statement and assurance given on behalf of Respondent No. 2/School, no further order is required to be passed in the writ petition, which is accordingly disposed of along with the pending application.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 15, 2025

S.Sharma