



2024-04-03 15:14:37

\$~77 & 78

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 933/2021**

ZULFIQUAR HAIDAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Amit George, Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Mr. Vaibhav Gandhi, Mr. Abhigyan
Dwivedi, Ms. Priya Dwivedi,
Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

NAJMA AKHTAR & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, SC for DES
with Ms. Shweta Singh, Mr. Sangeet
Kumar, Mr. Shiv Chopra and Ms.
Mehvish Khan, Advocates.
Mr. Sujeet K. Mishra and Mr. Harsh
Kumar Pandey, Advocates for DOE.

+ **W.P.(C) 8318/2020, CM APPL. 26973/2020, CM APPL. 857/2021,
CM APPL. 10494/2022, CM APPL. 13711/2023, CM APPL.
21030/2023, CM APPL. 23404/2023, CM APPL. 48803/2023, CM
APPL. 65431/2023, CM APPL. 76453/2024, CM APPL. 71742/2025**

ZULFIQUAR HAIDAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Amit George, Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Mr. Vaibhav Gandhi, Mr. Abhigyan
Dwivedi, Ms. Priya Dwivedi,
Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

**MANAGING COMMITTEE OF ANGLO ARABIC SENIOR
SECONDARY SCHOOL & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, SC for DES
with Ms. Shweta Singh, Mr. Sangeet
Kumar, Mr. Shiv Chopra and Ms.



Mehvish Khan, Advocates.
Mr. Sujeet K. Mishra and Mr. Harsh
Kumar Pandey, Advocates for DOE.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

12.03.2026

%

1. Dr. Amit George, counsel for the Petitioner, emphasises that the Petitioner has been serving on the post of Librarian with the school since July, 2009.
2. He points out that the Petitioner's initial engagement was pursuant to a public recruitment process, as is evident from the advertisement issued in a Delhi newspaper. Though the appointment was described as temporary, in substance, it bore all the incidents of a regular appointment. The Petitioner's tenure came to be extended from year to year without break, and he has continued to serve on the post of Librarian ever since.
3. Dr. George further submits that the Petitioner was also assigned the additional responsibility of Assistant Warden, on account of which residential accommodation was provided to him. His salary, which was fixed at Rs. 12,000/- per month at the time of his initial appointment, has risen only to Rs. 14,000/- per month. In that backdrop, the accommodation, according to him, is not a gratuitous benefit but a necessary incident of service which enables the Petitioner to sustain himself and his family, including his three daughters.
4. It is further submitted that, having served for such a long period, the Petitioner has acquired a right to seek regularisation in terms of the principles recognised in the decisions of the Supreme Court as well as of this



Court. It is urged that, until that issue is properly considered, the Petitioner ought not to be compelled to vacate the accommodation presently in his occupation.

5. On instructions, Dr. George also disputes the Respondents' allegation that the Petitioner has failed to report for duty. According to the Petitioner, he has always been ready and willing to join duties, but has been prevented from doing so by the Respondents themselves. It is submitted that this has also resulted in non-payment of the Petitioner's dues from the year 2022 onwards.

6. Dr. George further submits, on instructions, that the Petitioner is willing to explore an alternative course if the school is likewise inclined to arrive at a workable arrangement. At the very least, it is submitted, the Petitioner's outstanding wages ought to be released forthwith, and he ought to be permitted to resume duties. He further states that, should the school come forward with a reasonable proposal, the Petitioner would be willing to consider an overall arrangement, including matters relating to accommodation, resumption of duties, and other connected issues.

7. Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, Standing Counsel appearing for the Delhi Education Society, submits that, in light of the submissions now advanced on behalf of the Petitioner, he would seek instructions from the management as to whether the school is willing to explore any regular arrangement or other workable terms. He emphasises, however, that the management has serious concerns arising from what it perceives to be repeated complaints and administrative difficulties generated by the Petitioner while continuing on the campus. In response, Dr. George, while disputing that characterisation, states on instructions that the Petitioner would act



responsibly and would not give cause for such apprehension.

8. Re-notify on 27th March, 2026.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 12, 2026/ab