



\$~73

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1794/2026 & CM APPL. 8698/2026**

VINOD KUMAR MALIK

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Chandrika Prasad Mishra, Ms. Swati Surbhi, Mr. Ankit Pandey, Ms. Prashasti Singh and Ms. Harshita Bhardwaj, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey, Advocates for R-1. Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC for GNCTD with Mr. N.K. Singh, Ms. Aliza Alam and Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocates for GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

09.02.2026

1. This writ petition seeks the following reliefs:

“a. Issue a Writ of Mandamus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for passing directions to the Respondent No.1 i.e., Director of Education of Government of NCT of Delhi to constitute and conduct a proper and independent enquiry into the allegations of tampering and/or forgery of the Petitioner’s MACP/ACR, and to take appropriate action against the person(s) found responsible, strictly in accordance with the applicable rules and law; and/or

b. Issue a Writ of Mandamus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for passing directions to the Respondent No.1 i.e., Director of Education of Government of NCT of Delhi to conclude the enquiry into the allegations of tampering and/or forgery of the Petitioner’s MACP/ACR and submits its report with one month; and/or

c. Issue a Writ of Mandamus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



the Respondent No.1 i.e., Director of Education of Government of NCT of Delhi to pay compensation of Rs. 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only) to the Petitioner for the harassment, mental agony, and hardship suffered by him on account of the arbitrary inaction and failure of Respondent No.1 to discharge its statutory duties”

2. Counsel for the Respondents objects to the maintainability of the petition on the ground that the institution in question is a government school and, therefore, the Petitioner has an efficacious alternative remedy before the Central Administrative Tribunal. Reliance is placed on the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.***,¹ to contend that service disputes of this nature must first be agitated before the CAT rather than by invoking the writ jurisdiction of this Court.
3. In view of the above, counsel for the Petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the present petition with liberty to approach the Central Administrative Tribunal, in accordance with law.
4. Leave and liberty as prayed for are granted.
5. Dismissed along with pending application.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 9, 2026

as

¹ (1997) 3 SCC 261.