



\$~81

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4969/2024**

**RAISINA BENGALI SCHOOL SOCIETY THROUGH ITS
SECRETARY MANAGER GOVERNING BODY & ANR.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Anukul Raj, Mrs. Nikita Raj, Mr.
Tushar Bhalla, Mr. Naveen, Advs.

versus

**GOVT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI &
ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Panel
Counsel(Civil), GNCTD, Mrs
Chandrika Sachdev, Mr. Dhruv
Kumar, Advs. for R-1
Mr. Rajesh Srivastava Advocate and
Mr. Rahul Kumar Advocate

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH**

ORDER

27.02.2026

%

CM APPL. 13525/2026

1. This is an application filed under Section 151 of CPC, seeking revival of the main petition.
2. The main petition was disposed of *vide* order dated 20.01.2026, wherein it was observed and directed as under:-

“ 2. Mr. Raj, learned counsel for the petitioner, has drawn my attention to various documents to show that the petitioner school has been set up, managed and administered by a linguistic



minority i.e. Bengali. He further states that the governing body from the date of institution till today only comprises of Bengali people and the 52nd report submitted by the Commissioner for Linguistic Minority recognizes Bengali as a linguistic minority.

3. He further draws my attention to documents annexed at Annexure P-24, pursuant to which the petitioner school came to occupy the land in question.

4. Additionally, the society runs 2 schools, one at Chittranjan Park and the one at Mandir Marg. The school at Chittranjan Park has already been granted a linguistic minority status.

5. Mr. Rohatgi, learned counsel for the respondents, object to the same and states that the petitioner has not given its land allotment papers and that is the reason the respondent has been unable to process the application of the petitioner.

6. Mr. Raj, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the documents annexed as Annexure P-24 with this petition are the only papers of allotment with the petitioner.

7. The Department of Education directed to consider the petition as a representation and dispose of the same expeditiously and in any case not later than 4 weeks from today.

8. The petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms.

9. In case the petitioner is aggrieved by any action of the respondents, the petitioner is at liberty to revive the petition.”

3. For the reasons stated in the application, issue notice.

4. Ms. Sachdev, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No. 1 and states that the petitioners submitted some additional



documents on 31.01.2026 and hence the delay.

5. I am unable to comprehend the said argument.

6. Assuming that the additional documents were given on 31.01.2026, 4 weeks expired today. Despite that the order has not been passed.

7. The directions given by the Court must be followed in its letter, spirit and entirety and the administrative delays cannot be a ground for not complying with the timelines fixed by the Court.

8. For the said reasons, the responsible officer shall explain on affidavit as to why the guidelines of the Court have not been followed scrupulously.

9. In case the order is passed on or before 02.03.2026, the Court may be inclined to take a lenient view.

10. Issue notice to all other respondents through all modes including electronic on the petitioners taking steps within one week from today.

11. List on 10.03.2026.

JASMEET SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2026/DM