



\$~3

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8703/2025**

**SAROJ BANSAL PRINCIPAL, ABHINAV PUBLIC SCHOOL,
PITAMPURA SCHOOL ID 1411243**Petitioner

Through: Mr. Namit Suir, Ms. Pepakayala
Geetanjali & Ms. Tanya Sharma,
Advocates.

versus

**DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF NCT
OF DELHI THROUGH DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF
EDUCATION, ZONE-11 & ORS.**Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Ms. Chandrika
Sachdev & Mr. Dhruv Kumar,
Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Ashwini K. Sakhuja, Advocate
for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **01.07.2025**

CM APPL. 37269/2025 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 8703/2025

1. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, seeking the following reliefs:-

“a. Issue a Writ, Order or Direction against Respondent No. 1 & 2 in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ to intimate the status of the final report of the inquiry proceedings initiated vide order dated 08.10.2024;

b. Issue a Writ, Order or Direction against Respondent No. 1 &



2 in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ to conclude inquiry proceedings initiated vide order dated 08.10.2024 within three weeks'

c. Issue a Writ, Order or Direction against Respondent No. 1 & 2 in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ to publish the final report of the inquiry proceedings initiated vide order dated 08.10.2024, incase the proceedings stands concluded;

d. Pass such other or further order(s) as this Court may deem fit in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondents in the facts and circumstances of the case."

2. It is the petitioner's case that she was appointed as the Vice-Principal of Abhinav Public School, Pitampura ["School"] in the year 2005, and assumed charge as the Principal/Head of School in the year 2015. Respondent No. 3 issued show-cause notices to the petitioner on 26.06.2024 and 27.06.2024, containing various allegations against her. In her reply dated 29.06.2024 to the show-cause notice dated 26.06.2024, the petitioner contested the authority of respondent No. 3 to act as Manager and to issue such notices. A copy of this communication was also addressed to the DoE.

3. The petitioner has thus raised a contention that respondent No. 3, who is functioning as the Manager of the School, is not qualified for the said position under the relevant rules and guidelines of respondent No. 1 – Directorate of Education ["DoE"], and that he is drawing salary contrary to the Rules. The petitioner's grievance in the present writ petition is that her representation to this effect has not been considered by the DoE, although an inquiry was admittedly initiated on 08.10.2024.

4. The petitioner claims to have been serving as Vice-Principal or Principal of the School since the year 2005, and respondent No. 3 was admittedly appointed as Manager of the School in the year 2007.



However, the petitioner's objections to the eligibility or conduct of respondent No. 3 have been raised for the first time only after issuance of show cause notices against her.

5. Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, learned counsel for the DoE, who appears on advance notice, submits that an inquiry has been initiated with regard to the functioning of respondent No. 3 as the Manager of the School and that the same will be concluded within a period of six weeks from today.

6. In view of this statement, no further orders are required in this petition. It is made clear that the DoE is at liberty to act in accordance with law, and the submission made on its behalf is recorded without prejudice to the rights and contentions of respondent No. 3.

7. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner has raised the present complaint nearly 17 years after the appointment of respondent No. 3 as the Manager of the School, and only after show-cause notices were issued to her, in the event she seeks to ventilate any further grievance in this regard, the issue of her *locus standi* may be considered at that time.

8. It is also noted that the present writ petition does not directly challenge the notices issued to the petitioner. Therefore, no orders are being passed regarding the validity of those notices.

9. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 1, 2025/'pv/sd'/