



CWP-2603-2026

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

(112)

CWP-2603-2026

Date of Decision : 04.02.2026

CBC Memorial School

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Pankaj Maini, Advocate, with
Mr. Virender Singh (Petitioner-in-person).

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl. AG, Haryana with
Mr. Salim Hooda, ADA, Director Secondary Education, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Mr. Pankaj Maini, Advocate, who had instituted the instant writ petition and was representing the petitioner, submits that he does not intend to pursue the matter further and seeks leave to withdraw his *vakalatnama*.

2. The request is allowed. Accordingly, Mr. Pankaj Maini, Advocate, is discharged from his responsibility to pursue the instant writ petition. The petitioner, who is present in Court, submits that he shall argue the matter in person.

3. The instant writ petition clothes challenge to the order dated 16/21.01.2026 (Annexure P-19), passed by the respondent No.2- Director General, Secondary Education, Haryana, whereby the recognition granted to the petitioner-school has been withdrawn with effect from the next academic session. Moreover, a challenge is also laid to the letter dated 22.01.2026



(Annexure P-20), whereby the respondent No.2 has directed the Block Education Officer, Barwala, to ensure that students enrolled in the petitioner-school for the current academic session are shifted to a nearby Government school.

4. The petitioner, Virender Singh, submits that he has been managing the affairs of the school for the last 35 years and no complaint had ever been raised against him during this period. It is contended that the respondent-department has failed to disburse the statutory reimbursement entitlements under the Chief Minister Haryana Equal Education Relief, Assistance and Grant Scheme (hereinafter referred to as the “CHEERAG Scheme”), which succeeded Rule 134-A of the Haryana School Education Rules, 2003, and that such dues have remained unpaid for approximately four years despite submission of all requisite documents appertaining to the CHEERAG Scheme. It is further contended that after the petitioner approached the Union of India and secured a favourable order, the authorities, being aggrieved thereby, passed the impugned order in misuse of power.

5. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by the petitioner and has also made a studied survey of the record.

6. A perusal of the record makes graphic emergence that the petitioner obstructed the inquiry being conducted by the Headquarters-level Committee, misbehaved with its officials, and threatened to lodge an FIR against them. Moreover, the petitioner was called upon to join the proceedings before the respondent No.2, however, he chose not to do so. Consequently, owing to such non-cooperation and in view of complaints received from parents supported by affidavits, the impugned order came to be passed.



7. Furthermore, during the course of hearing, the petitioner was unable to demonstrate any perversity, illegality, or procedural impropriety in the impugned order. He, however, submitted that he is still willing to cooperate and to furnish all relevant documents to the respondent No.2, if granted an opportunity. Accordingly, during the pre-lunch session, learned State counsel was directed to have instructions from the authority concerned and to apprise this Court of the specific documents required from the petitioner.

8. In the post-lunch session, learned State counsel, on instructions from Mr. Salim Hooda, ADA, Director Secondary Education, Haryana, furnished a list of 14 documents required from the petitioner. The list is taken on record as '**Mark-A**', and a copy thereof is also supplied to the petitioner. Upon being specifically queried whether he was ready and willing to furnish the said documents to facilitate the conclusion of the inquiry initiated on the basis of complaints from parents, the petitioner, instead of expressing willingness, submitted that members of the Committee had visited the school premises on 08.10.2025 and had taken possession of the entire record. In support of this claim, he placed on record a photocopy of the visitor's book, which is taken on record as '**Mark-B**'. He also produced certain vouchers, which are taken on record collectively as '**Mark-C**', to substantiate his contention that the documents had been handed over to the respondent-department.

9. This Court has examined the visitor's book (Mark-B). While it evidences the visits of members of the Committee on 08.10.2025 and 16.11.2025, it does not indicate that any documents were taken into custody by the Committee or the department. The vouchers (Mark-C) also merely



reflect certain financial transactions relating to contingency expenses and do not substantiate the petitioner's claim.

10. Learned State counsel, assisted by Mr. Salim Hooda, ADA, Director Secondary Education, Haryana, has produced a copy of an undertaking dated 08.10.2025 furnished by the petitioner, wherein he assured that the documents sought would be supplied to the respondent-department within 2–3 working days. The undertaking is taken on record as '**Mark-D**', and the relevant extract thereof reads as under:-

“The compliance of the points 1-7 of the documents required will be provide under 2-3 consecutive official day to your respectful office.”

11. When this Court confronted the petitioner with the said undertaking, he admitted having furnished it but offered an unconvincing explanation that the department had subsequently taken away the entire record. No cogent evidence or document has been produced to substantiate this assertion.

12. The aforesaid facts demonstrate a clear reluctance on the part of the petitioner to furnish the documents necessary for completion of the ongoing inquiry. Even during the course of hearing, this Court granted ample opportunities to the petitioner to hand over the documents, however, he failed to do so and instead relied upon unsubstantiated explanations. Accordingly, this Court can safely draw an inference that the petitioner has no intention of handing over the relevant documents to the respondent-department.

13. This Court has also examined the impugned order. A complaint is pending against the petitioner-school alleging that it charged fees from students admitted under the CHEERAG Scheme, in violation of the Scheme guidelines. In order to ascertain the veracity of these allegations, a

**CWP-2603-2026****5**

Headquarters-level Committee was constituted to inspect the school. The impugned order reflects that the petitioner not only created hindrance by not providing the requisite documents to the Committee but also threatened its members. Furthermore, affidavits and statements have been submitted by certain parents against the petitioner-school, alleging irregularities, denial of school leaving certificates, unauthorized demands for money, wrongful marking of attendance on the MIS portal, and improper claims for reimbursement under the CHEERAG Scheme. The petitioner has failed to specifically rebut these allegations.

14. In summa, this Court finds no merit in the instant writ petition, and the same is accordingly **dismissed**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

February 04, 2026
Manpreet/devinder

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No