



\$~41

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

+ LPA 307/2025 & CM APPLs. 28961-65/2025 & 47639/2026

PARIMAL BIJOLI & ANR. ....Appellants

Through: Mr. Joydeep Mazumdar, Ms. U. Srivastava and Mr. Nischay Sharma, Advocates.

Versus

RAISINA BENGALI SCHOOL, C.R.PARK & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anukul Raj and Ms. Nikita Raj, Mr. Tushar Bhalla, Mr. Naveen and Mr. Vishal Yadav, Advocates.

Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey, Advocates.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA**

**ORDER**

**03.02.2026**

%

1. The present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant being aggrieved by the Order and Judgment dated 12.11.2024 (“**Impugned Judgment**”) passed in Writ Petition (C) 4283/2024 (“**Writ Petition**”), whereby the Writ Petition filed by Respondent No. 1, Raisina Bengali School (“**School**”) was allowed, and it was directed that the Director of Education shall not have authority to interdict the process of appointment of the teachers through direct recruitment, subject to compliance with the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973 (“**DSE Rules**”).

2. The Appellants were not parties to the Writ Petition filed by the School, however, the present Appeal has been filed in the capacity as the parents of the students studying with the School, as the rights and interests



of the said students are alleged to have been prejudiced and adversely affected by the Impugned Judgment.

3. The Appellants have submitted that they are aggrieved with the Impugned Judgment to the extent that it concluded that Rule 96 of DSE Rules is not applicable to aided minority schools, while Rules 127 and 128 of DSE Rules, which are applicable to unaided minority schools, are to be adhered to.

4. The Director of Education, Government of NCT of Delhi has already preferred an Appeal being LPA No. 372/2025, challenging the Impugned Judgment and the School is the Respondent therein. As the Appellants were not parties in the Writ Petition and the Impugned Judgment has already been challenged in LPA No. 372/2025 filed by the Director of Education, which is pending consideration before this Court, the Appellants are not entitled to prefer this Appeal in the capacity of parents of the students studying with the School.

5. The students studying in the School have no locus to determine the issues with regard to the appointment of the teachers in the School. The DSE Rules do not provide any involvement of the students in the process of recruitment of the teachers in the School. Hence, the present Appeal filed by the parents of the students, challenging the Impugned Judgment is not maintainable and deserves to be dismissed.

6. Accordingly, the present Appeal and the pending Applications are dismissed.

**DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ**

**TEJAS KARIA, J**

**FEBRUARY 03, 2026/sms**