



\$~40.

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

+ LPA 594/2025

DELHI PUBLIC SCHOOL DWARKAAppellant

Through: Mr. Pinaki Mishra, Sr. Adv., Mr. Puneet Mittal, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Bhuvan Gugani, Mr. Rupendra Pratap Singh, Ms. Sakshi Mendiratta, Mr. Rupender Sharma, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR PROTECTION OF CHILD RIGHTS
AND ORSRespondents

Through: Ms. Avni Singh, Panel Counsel, GNCTD with Ms. Harshita Nathrani, Adv. for R-2,4,5,6.
Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, CGSC with Mr. Kautilya Birat, Mr. Ankush Kapoor, Advs. for R-3.
Mr. Manish Gupta, Mr. Prateek Gupta, Mr. Sowmya China and Ms. Hitanshi, Advs. for R-7 to R-33.
Mr. Manoj Loomba, Adv.
Mr. Vishant Prakash, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

% **19.09.2025**

CM APPL. 59708/2025

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CM APPL. 59709/2025

3. Present application has been filed seeking condonation of delay of 56 days in filing the appeal.
4. For the reasons stated in the application, the delay in filing the present appeal is hereby condoned.



5. The application stands disposed of.

LPA 594/2025, CM APPL. 59707/2025, & CM APPL. 59710/2025

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. This intra-Court appeal under Clause X of the Letters Patent has been filed taking exception to an order dated 05.06.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in CM APPL.29976/2025 in W.P.(C) 10434/2024.

8. It has been argued by Shri Pinaki Mishra, learned senior counsel representing the appellant that: (i) The order under challenge herein was passed by the learned Single Judge on an application moved by the parents of the students of the petitioner – school (Delhi Public School, Dwarka) and though the said applicant has filed an application seeking its impleadment, however, the same has yet not been allowed; (ii) While passing the order under challenge, the learned Single Judge has made certain observations specially in paragraphs 15, 16 and 17 of the said order which are not only prejudicial to the interest of the appellant school but such observations also cast aspersions/ stigma on the appellant/school; and (iii) It has been further argued on behalf of the appellant that such observations could not have been made by the learned Single Judge specially on an application filed by a non-party to the proceedings and that too without affording an opportunity of hearing to rebut the assertions made in the application on which the order has been passed.

9. Learned counsel representing the respondent Nos. 7 to 33, however, refuted the above submissions made by learned senior counsel for the appellant and has submitted that having regard to the subject matter of the writ petition, the parents of the students have ample locus to intervene in the proceedings and further that on the application seeking impleadment by the parents notice was issued.



10. He further submits that though it is true that no formal order impleading the parents has been passed by the learned Single Judge, however, having regard to the interest of the students which can be asserted by their parents, the order under challenge has been passed. He has denied the assertions made by learned senior counsel for the appellant that no opportunity of rebutting the averments made in the application was given to the appellant.

11. Be that as it may, so far as the directions issued in the impugned order are concerned, the appellant does not press for any relief against the said directions. However, it has been urged by learned senior counsel for the appellant that in respect of certain observations made by the learned Single Judge which, according to him, are prejudicial/ casts aspersions and stigma, the present appeal may be allowed.

12. Having regard to such a prayer made, we find it appropriate to grant opportunity to the appellant to move an appropriate application seeking expunction of the observations which, according to the appellant are casting stigma or recrimination on the appellant school. If any such application is made, the same shall be considered and decided by the learned Single Judge in accordance with law and with expedition.

13. We make it clear that we have not made any observations as to the claim of the respective parties.

14. The appeal stands disposed of.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

SEPTEMBER 19, 2025/ N.Khanna