



\$~81

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

+ W.P.(C) 10034/2025

SWATI BASU ROY

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Indrani Ghosh, Advocate.

versus

MANAGING COMMITTEE SRI SATHYA SAI VIDYA VIHAR
& ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Latika Chaudhary, Advocate
for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **16.07.2025**

1. The petitioner served as a Teacher in the Respondent No. 1 – Sri Sathya Sai Vidya Vihar [“School”] from the year 1992 until April 2020. By way of this writ petition, she seeks grant of statutory dues, including fixation of pay under the recommendations of Sixth and Seventh Central Pay Commissions, arrears of Dearness Allowance, Bonus, Modified Assured Career Progression Scheme [“MACP”], Gratuity, Leave Encashment, and other related benefits.
2. Although the petitioner claims to have approached the School on several occasions in the past, the first written communication placed on record is dated 18.05.2025. In response, the petitioner received a communication from the Principal of the School suggesting that a meeting could be scheduled to discuss her grievances. However, instead of responding to this offer, the petitioner has approached the Court at this



stage.

3. Ms. Indrani Ghosh, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is willing to make an earnest attempt to resolve the issue with the School while reserving her rights and remedies, should further action be necessary. Ms. Ghosh, however, seeks directions to ensure that the School takes an expeditious decision.

4. Even if the petitioner's claims are accepted, a final resolution of her grievances would require detailed computation of dues across several heads. I am, therefore, of the view that an attempt for mutual resolution, as offered by the School, would be advantageous.

5. It is expected that both parties will cooperate with each other and make sincere efforts to resolve the pending reconciliation of accounts, as expeditiously as possible. If no mutually acceptable reconciliation is reached within the next eight weeks, the petitioner will be at liberty to approach the Court again. In the event of any dispute regarding computation, the parties may also approach the concerned Deputy Director of Education. Ms. Latika Chaudhary, learned counsel for the respondent – Directorate of Education ["DoE"], who appears on advance notice, states that DoE will take necessary action, as may be required.

6. Although the School is not represented today, the School may file an application for any clarification or further directions, if necessary.

7. The writ petition is disposed of with these directions.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 16, 2025

UK/sd/