



\$~20

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

+ W.P.(C) 14057/2018

MRS. HARPREET KAUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jitesh Talwani, Mr.
Abhimanyu Goel & Mr. Sahil
Mahajan, Advocates.

versus

QUEEM MARY'S GIRLS SCHOOL AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Ratakshi Sarvaria & Mr. Rohit
Sharma, Advocates for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

10.07.2025

1. The petitioner is a teacher in the respondent No. 1 – Queen Mary's Girls School ["School"]. She has filed this writ petition contending that the School was not permitting her to attend to her duties with effect from 27.10.2018. The reliefs sought in the writ petition are as follows:-

"i. issue any appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the respondent school to forthwith allow the petitioner to join her duties and also to pay to her due salaries for month of October 2018;

ii. issue any appropriate writ, order or direction directing the respondent school to pay to the petitioner an adequate amount of compensation on account of unnecessary causing her mental harassment;

iii. Issue any appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Directorate of Education, Government of NCT of Delhi to take appropriate actions against the respondent school in accordance with law for failure on the part of respondent school to allow the petitioner to join duties and to pay to her due salary for the month of October and onwards till date;

iv. Pass any such other or further orders as may be deemed just



and appropriate, in the facts and circumstances of the case and also in the interest of justice, in favour of the petitioner; and
v. allow the present writ petition with cost, in favour of the petitioner and against the respondents.”

2. I have heard Mr. Jitesh Talwani, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Ms. Ratakshi Sarvaria, learned counsel for the School.
3. The undisputed position is that the petitioner has been reinstated in the services of the School with effect from 07.01.2019, which is also recorded in the order dated 18.07.2022. It is also undisputed that her salary for the month of October 2018 has been paid.
4. Mr. Talwani states that the only question remaining to be adjudicated concerns the petitioner's salary for the months of November and December 2018.
5. Ms. Sarvaria submits that there is no specific prayer to this effect and, in any event, as recorded in the order dated 02.08.2022, the petitioner has also filed a civil suit [CS(DJ) 741/2019] with regard to arrears of salary. Although the petitioner was permitted to place a copy of the said suit before this Court by the order dated 02.08.2022, she has not done so. However, Mr. Talwani submits that the relief sought in the suit is different, inasmuch as it pertains to grant of salary in terms of the report of the Seventh Central Pay Commission, and with regard to the petitioner's date of appointment.
6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that the petitioner's principal grievance has been satisfied, as she has been permitted to rejoin her duties and her salary for the month of October 2018 has been paid.
7. As far as future salary is concerned, i.e. pending salary for the



months of November and December 2018, the petitioner herself in prayer ‘iii’, seeks a direction upon the Directorate of Education [“DoE”], to take appropriate action against the School. In these circumstances, she is permitted to make a representation to the DoE for this purpose, which will be considered in accordance with law after hearing both the petitioner and the School. If the petitioner remains aggrieved, it will be open to her to exercise her remedies, including by way of appropriate reliefs in the pending civil suit.

8. I am informed that there are several other pending litigations between the parties. It is made clear that these directions are without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties in other pending litigation.

9. The writ petition stands disposed of with these directions.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 10, 2025

‘pv/KA/sd’/