

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-PIL No. 53 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of decision:- 29.05.2020

Bal Kranti TrustPetitioner
Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE**
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE.

Present:- Mr. Sushil Kumar Verma, petitioner in person.
 Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana,
 for respondents No.1 to 4.
 Mr. P.S.Bajwa, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana,
 for respondent No.2.
 Mr. Pankaj Jain, Sr. Standing Counsel for U.T. Chandigarh.

* * * *

RAVI SHANKER JHA, C.J. (ORAL)

With the consent of the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents, the matter is being taken up and heard via video conferencing (Webex App software).

This petition has been filed by the petitioner trust registered in Bhiwani District praying for a direction to the respondent-authorities to prohibit the private schools from charging fees other than the tuition fees from the students.

It is informed that the circulars and orders issued by the State of Haryana dated 23.04.2020 and subsequent circulars and orders directing the private schools not to charge fees other than tuition fee have been assailed by the association of private schools by filing three different Civil Writ Petition Nos. 7453-2020, 7513-2020 and 7535-2020 which are pending before this Court. It is further informed that a similar issue arising from the State of Uttarakhand is pending before the Supreme Court in Special Leave Petition No. 6782 of 2020.

In the circumstances, we are not inclined to entertain the present petition at this stage firstly on account of the fact that none of the private schools have been impleaded as the respondents in the petition and secondly on account of the fact that the petitioner in respect of one particular instance has already approached the Chairman of the Grievances Redressal

Committee by filing Annexure P-8 and the matter is pending before the said authority.

It is informed by learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State of Haryana that the Grievance Redressal Committee is competent to decide the complaint (Annexure P_-8) filed by the petitioner and that it shall do so in accordance with law expeditiously.

In the circumstances, the petition filed by the petitioner is disposed of giving liberty to the petitioner to pursue the complaint (Annexure P-8) before the Grievance Redressal Committee, Panipat. It goes without saying that as undertaken by the learned Additional Advocate Geneal the matter shall be looked into and decided by the Grievance Redressal Committee, Panipat, expeditiously in accordance with law. It is made clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case specifically in view of the fact that the circulars and orders issued by the State of Haryana are subject matter of challenge in three different petitions and similar matters are also pending before the Supreme Court.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

29.05.2020
ravinder sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No