

the virtual frustration of the directions issued by us in our order dated 19.02.2026 regarding the conduct of a meeting by the ad hoc committee constituted by this Court for the purposes of streamlining the management of this heritage school.

6. Incidentally, this Court's order made in this Public Interest Litigation appointing an ad hoc committee was challenged by the State before the Hon'ble Supreme Court on various grounds. However, the Hon'ble Supreme Court disposed of the S.L.P by its order dated 06.02.2026, which reads as follows:

- 1. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners.*
- 2. We dispose of these Special Leave Petitions by observing that all the observations made by the High Court in the impugned order are for the purpose of making an interim arrangement pending disposal of the writ petition which is in the nature of a Public Interest Litigation before the High Court.*
- 3. We however request the High Court to dispose of the said writ petition as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of six months from today.*
- 4. All contentions on both sides are left open to be advanced in the final arguments to be made in the writ petition including the contention regarding the term of the General Body and which is a matter of concern to the petitioner herein which is an issue which is left open to be considered in the writ petition at the time of final hearing.*
- 5. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.*

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court specifically took cognisance of the fact that this writ petition is in the nature of a Public Interest Litigation before the High Court and also requested the High Court to dispose of

the writ petition as expeditiously as possible and preferably within six months.

- 8.** In order to facilitate the final hearing of this petition and also to comply with the orders earlier made, we had made a detailed order on 19.02.2026 for the ad hoc committee to meet and decide on the issues concerning the proper management of the school, which, from the material placed on record, was declined.
- 9.** In this matter, we noted that there was no cooperation from those controlling the school's management, and even the Secretaries of the Government of Jharkhand were not taking any real interest in restoring the school and its management to their former glory. Even our orders requiring the Secretaries to attend the meeting were not being complied with, or were being met by sending only the deputies.
- 10.** From our order of 19.02.2026, it is clear that concerted efforts were being made to see that the ad hoc committee appointed by the Court does not function. Some of the members were physically prevented, and, in any event, several personal and trivial issues were raised to frustrate the orders of the Court.
- 11.** Despite our order of 19.02.2026, we are rather pained to note that the meeting which we had directed was again frustrated on the spurious plea that the Sabhapati, who attended the meeting through V.C., was unwell and that he had no authority to allegedly delegate his powers to one Shri Raj Kumar, a member of the ad hoc committee. This was not a question of delegation at all; it was a very reasonable request by the Sabhapati, who was ailing and unable to speak. Still, by adopting a hyper-technical approach, possibly with the intention of frustrating this Court's order, the meeting was not held.

- 12.** Realizing that this issue could be raised in today's hearing, the 11th respondent, who is the Administrative Officer of the school, allegedly in his personal capacity, has filed his application claiming that the petitioner was a contractor for making some supplies to the school and because, there were disputes with regard to payments and supplies, out of spite this purported Public Interest Litigation has been instituted by him. Secondly, it is contended that the petitioner failed to disclose his personal interest in the matter, and this failure amounts to a breach of the P.I.L Rules framed by this Court.
- 13.** We have heard Mr Tandon in support of his I. A and also perused the averments therein and the documents annexed thereto. Upon evaluation of all this material, we are satisfied that the very filing of such an I.A. is a gross abuse of the process of this Court and this I.A., is required to be dismissed with exemplary costs personally payable by Mr Roshan Kumar Baxi (R-11), without in any manner taxing the school's finances.
- 14.** This interim application, in fact, is one out of a series of attempts to frustrate this Court's orders. In such matters, the message is more important than the messenger. The petitioner has highlighted serious issues affecting the school, which is an old and famous institution that has produced eminent personalities for the States of Bihar and Jharkhand. The contribution of this school has been lauded at several national and international levels. Concerned about the declining standards arising from the manner in which the school was managed, this Public Interest Litigation was instituted.
- 15.** This Court, as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court, has taken cognisance of this position. This Court appointed an ad hoc committee

in the public interest to see whether the conditions at the school improve and the school is restored to its past glory. The challenge to this order failed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

- 16.** Before the matter could be finally heard, it was necessary that the ad hoc committee and all stakeholders, including the Principal and the Administrative Officer, who have filed this I.A., at least meet to find solutions so that the school functions properly. Instead, we get the impression that those presently in management, which would include the Principal and this Administrative Officer, are making all-out efforts to see that there is not even any investigation into the functioning of the school, and further, they appear not to be open to even some suggestions so that the functioning of the school improves.
- 17.** From the manner in which this matter has proceeded, we are not too sure whether the Administrative Officer is acting in his own capacity or at the behest of others presently in management of the school. In any event, from the averments and the documents, we do not think that this petition can be styled as a "Personal Interest Litigation" or a "Paisa Interest Litigation" as has been alleged. Merely because the petitioner may have been some contractor, a circumstance that the petitioner also does not admit, we cannot say that this petition has been instituted out of spite. There was no necessity to disclose such issues while filing the petition.
- 18.** Another objection raised to the maintainability of this petition was based on the order dated 24.02.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge (Rajesh Shankar, J.) allowing the petitioner to withdraw his W.P.(C) No. 4429 of 2022 with liberty to raise the issue before the appropriate forum/court of law. It was argued that similar contentions

were raised by the petitioner in the said writ petition and after withdrawal of the said writ petition, this petition could not be held to be maintainable.

- 19.** Again, we think that this is a frivolous objection. The perusal of the order dated 24.02.2023 indicates that an objection was raised on behalf of some of the respondents in the said petition that the petitioner had no personal cause of action. Therefore, the petitioner, withdrew the said petition with liberty to raise the issues before the appropriate forum/court of law. Such liberty was in fact granted. Therefore, based upon the order dated 24.02.2023, it cannot be said that this Public Interest Litigation is not maintainable.
- 20.** Significantly, this petition was instituted in 2025, and several orders have been issued in it. All this while, the 11th respondent never felt it necessary to raise the issue of maintainability. This necessity was felt only because it was apprehended that this Court would seriously view the non-compliance with its orders, even holding a meeting of the ad hoc committee. Therefore, we believe that even the filing of this I.A. was motivated and constitutes an abuse of the judicial process.
- 21.** Accordingly, we dismiss this I.A. with costs of Rs. 25,000/- which Mr. Roshan Kumar Baxi (R-11) will have to personally pay in favor of "Braj Kishore Netraheen Balika Vidyalaya, C/o Mrs. Neelu Verma, 60, Booty Road, Bariatu, Ranchi" (which is a school for visually impaired girls). The cost should be deposited by the 11th respondent in this Court within ten days from today. Upon deposit, the Registry will ensure that this amount is given to "Braj Kishore Netraheen Balika Vidyalaya" at the earliest.
- 22.** The Sabhapati Shri Ashok Kumar Sinha, on account of health issues,

has expressed an inability to function as the Sabhapati of the ad hoc executive committee. Accordingly, we relieve him of the responsibility as a Sabhapati and appoint Shri Raj Kumar in his place. Shri Raj Kumar is a retired I.A.S. officer and a member of the Netarhat Old Boys Association (NOBA). This means that Shri Raj Kumar is also an ex-student of the school.

- 23.** Though we are pained that the ad hoc executive committee meeting is not taking place for hyper technical reasons, we once again repeat our directions contained in the order dated 19.02.2026, with the modification that this time, Shri Raj Kumar shall function as the Sabhapati. All the members of the ad hoc executive committee must co-operate with Shri Raj Kumar and not, once again, frustrate the holding of the meeting or frustrate the orders made by this Court from time to time.
- 24.** Since the Secretaries of the Government of Jharkhand had attended the meeting scheduled for 14.03.2026, we had expected that they would have reasonably allowed the meeting to proceed. However, this time, we hope and expect that they will render all co-operation to the newly appointed Sabhapati and see that the meeting proceeds.
- 25.** The meeting should now be held on 02.05.2026 at 11.00 a.m. The directions contained in our order dated 19.02.2026 are now reiterated with the above modifications.
- 26.** In particular, the Principal must comply with all directions issued to him and not avoid compliance on the specious plea that the directions in the order dated 19.02.2026 do not hold good.
- 27.** We request Mr Raj Kumar, the newly appointed Sabhapati, to file a report in this Court before the next date.

- 28.** List this matter for further consideration on 18.06.2026. All concerned are to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

April 16, 2026
Manish/Ritesh