



\$~20 & 21

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

+ W.P.(C) 9928/2020

KUTTAMPARAMPATH SUDHA NAIR

.....Petitioner

Through:

versus

MANAGING COMMITTEE SRI SATHYA SAI VIDYA VIHAR &
ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anurag Lakhotia & Mr. Udit
Dwivedi, Advocates for R-1.

Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with Ms. Jyoti
Tyagi, Ms. Vishruti Pandey and Mr.
Sachin Garg, Advocates for R-2.

+ W.P.(C) 10053/2020

RAJEEV KUMAR DHINGRA

.....Petitioner

Through:

versus

MANAGING COMMITTEE SRI SATHYA SAI VIDYA VIHAR &
ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anurag Lakhotia & Mr. Udit
Dwivedi, Advocates for R-1.

Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with Ms. Jyoti
Tyagi, Ms. Vishruti Pandey and Mr.
Sachin Garg, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

10.02.2026

%

1. On 28th January, 2026, the following order was passed:

"1. Counsel for Respondent School submits that the dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent School stands settled.

2. Let the terms of settlement be placed on record. Counsel for the Petitioners is also directed to confirm the settlement from her clients. In the absence of any such confirmation to the contrary, it shall be presumed that



the matter has been settled.

3. *Renotify on 10th February, 2026.”*

2. Today, there is no appearance on behalf of the Petitioners. However, counsel for Respondent No.1 reiterates that the disputes between the school and the Petitioners stand settled. He submits that the terms of settlement in respect of Kuttamparampath Sudha Nair (Petitioner in W.P.(C) 9928/2020) have been reduced into writing. He further states that Rajeev Kumar Dhingra (Petitioner in W.P.(C) 10053/2020) does not wish to pursue the present petition.

3. In view of the aforesaid, and there being no appearance on behalf of the Petitioners to dispute the settlement, the settlement is presumed to have been duly accepted.

4. Accordingly, the petitions are disposed of, along with pending applications, if any.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 10, 2026/hc