



\$~79

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 2290/2026 & CM APPL. 11051/2026, CM APPL.**
11052/2026
AMARDEEP SAGAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gautam Narayan, Sr. Adv with
Mr. R.A. Iyer, Adv, Ms. Asmita Singh, Adv, Mr.
Geet Dehariya, Adv

versus

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Dhruv Rohatgi Ms Chandrika
Sachdeva Mr. Dhruv Kumar, Advs. for GNCTD
Mr. Ravi Sikri, Sr. Advocate with Mr.
Pulkit Tare, Advocate Mr. Deepankar Yadav,
Advocate Mr. Jasbir Bidhuri, Advocate Mrs.
Parul Madaan, Advocate for R2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
20.02.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

“(a) Issue a writ of mandamus or a writ, order or directions in the nature of a mandamus directing the Respondent No. 1, Directorate of Education to strictly and in their terms implement the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973 as well as its own orders and directions to Respondent No. 2, particularly its order dated 24.6.2024;



(b) Issue a writ of mandamus or a writ, order or directions in the nature of a mandamus directing the Respondent No. 2, Ahlcon Public School to forthwith admit the ward of the Petitioner, Master Aarav Pratap Singh;”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner applied for the admission of his son Master Arav Pratap Singh in nursery and was selected in the first merit-based category at serial No. 108.
3. The petitioner, without prejudice to his rights, paid the entire school fee on 02.02.2006 and filed the same on 03.02.2006. The petitioner was, however, informed that the last date for depositing the fee was 02.02.2006 and hence, the admission of the child of the petitioner was cancelled. Hence, the present writ petition.
4. After some arguments, I am of the view that even though the respondent No.2 has filled the 200 seats, there is no legal impediment if the child of the petitioner is also included.
5. Ms. Sachdeva, learned counsel for the respondent No.1 states that the admission and the number of seats are exclusively within the domain of the respondent No.2 and the Department of Education has no objection if the child of the petitioner is admitted in view of the stay order granted by this Court in WP(C) 177/2014 and WP(C) 202/2014.
6. The fact whether the fee asked for by the respondent No.2 is an enhanced fee or not is not being adjudicated as the petitioner, without prejudice, has already paid the entire fee payment.
7. This Court under Article 226 has powers to do complete and substantial justice. Thus, it is directed that the admission of the petitioner's ward shall be done within 1 week from today and it is expected that the



parties will maintain cordiality and discipline.

8. Since the petition is being disposed of, Mr. Narayan, learned senior counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, does not press the allegations against the respondent No.2.
9. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 20, 2026 / (MS)