



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF DECEMBER, 2024

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO.23653 OF 2024 (EDN-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. ORGANISATION FOR UNAIDED
RECOGNISED SCHOOLS (R) (OUR SCHOOLS)
A SOCIETY REGISTERED UNDER
THE KARNATAKA SOCIETIES
REGISTRATION ACT 1960,
SPOORTIHI VIDYANIKETAN SCHOOL,
NO. 10, RAJAGOPALREDDY EXTENSION,
CIL LAYOUT MAIN ROAD,
CHOLANAYAKANAHALLI (HEBBALA),
RT NAGAR POST, VISHWANATHA,
NAGENAHALLI - 560 032,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
SHRI. N. PRABHKAR URS.
2. SHANTHARAM TRUST FOR EDUCATION
AND SOCIAL WELFARE ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT GUDDEMARANAHALLI, MAGADI
THALUK, SOLOUR,
RAMNAGAR DISTRICT - 562 127,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
SECRETARY JAYASIMHA G.
3. TRISHUL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT
K.B.R. MILL COMPOUND, BEHIND NEW BUS STOP,
DAVANAGERE, DISTRICT - 577 002,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY K.B. PRAKASH.
4. MARUTHE EDUCATONAL AND RURAL
DEVELOPMENT SOCIETY ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT CHANAKYA PUBLIC
SCHOOL, NEAR BYLANJANEYA TEMPLE, MUDALAPANNE,
KORATAGERE TALUK,
MADHUGIRI EDUCATIONAL, DISTRICT - 572 132,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY





S. NARASIMHALU BABU.

5. MARUTHI ACTION RESEARCH AND TRAINING TRUST ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT RESIDENCE NO.9,
1ST MAIN, SIDDAGANGA EXTENSION,
TUMAKUR - 572 129,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY G.V. SRINIVAS.
6. CHANDRABIMBA TRUST ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT D KALENAHALLY,
KASABA HOBLI, NEAR MYSORE, ROAD BUS STOP,
CHANNARAYAPATNA, HASAN DISTRICT - 573 116,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT DR. CHANDRAPPA.
7. JNANARASHMI EDUCATION SOCIETY ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT OLD UPPALLI, INDAVARA POST,
CHIKKAMAGALURU DISTRICT - 577 101.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
SHRI. LIKHITH N.P.
8. MODEL EDUCATION SOCIETY ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT MODEL EDUCATION SOCIETY
HIGH SCHOOL UPPALLI, INDAVARA POST,
CHIKKAMAGALURU DISTRICT - 577 101.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
SHRI M. N. SHADAKSHARI.
9. TIPPU EDUCATION AND RURAL
DEVELOPMENT TRUST ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT TIPPU EDUCATION
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT TRUST,
THOVINAKERE, KORATGERE,
TUMAKURU - 572 138,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
SMT. SUBAN SAB.
10. SRI POORNA PRAGNYA ACADEMY AND TRUST ® (TRUST),
REGISTERED OFFICE AT
RESIDENCE NO.9, 1ST MAIN, SIDDAGANGA EXTENSION,
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 129.
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT
G.V. SRINIVAS,



11. NANJIAH MEMORIAL EDUCATION FOUNDATION ®
(TRUST), NISARGA SCHOOL
KODGENHALLI, MADHUGIRI TALUK
TUMKUR - 572 127,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
G.T. KALPANA.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. S. SUDHARSAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
(PRIMARY SECONDARY EDUCATION),
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU - 560 001,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.
2. COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC OF INSTRUCTION,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
(PRIMARY SECONDARY EDUCATION)
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD, BENGALURU - 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. R.K. PRATHIBHA, AGA)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DECLARE THAT THE CIRCULAR ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA BEARING THE NOTIFICATION NO. C 7(2) PRA SHI A.MANYATHI SHARATHU 231.2018-19 DATED 06.06.2022 (ANNX-C AT PAGE NO. 47-48) IS ULTRA-VIRES THE KARNATAKA EDUCATION ACT, 1983 AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. The petitioners are before this Court seeking for following reliefs:



"WHEREFORE, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court be graciously pleased to:

- a) Issue a Writ of Certiorari declaring that the Circular issued by the Government of Karnataka bearing the Notification No. C 7(2) PRA SHI A. MANYATHI SHARATHU 231:2018-19 dated 06-06-2022 (ANNEXURE - C Page at ultra-vires the Karnataka Education Act, 1983. Nos. 47-48 is*
- b) Issue a Writ of Prohibition or a Writ or Direction of any other name or description to the Respondents against enforcement of the impugned Circular as against the Petitioners;*
- c) Pass such other order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of this case, in the interest of justice and equity."*

2. Petitioner No.1 is stated to be a Society and Association of unaided recognized schools in the State of Karnataka. Petitioner Nos.2 to 11 are individual unaided schools.
3. The petitioners are before this Court aggrieved by the circular issued by respondent No.1 dated 06.06.2022 at Annexure-A, requiring the schools to amongst others obtain and furnish a structural stability certificate, to obtain and furnish the plan sanction relating to the building where the school is being run and make available fire safety requirements/facilities for such schools etc.



4. The submission of Sri. S. Sudharshan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners is that,

4.1. The circular/order dated 06.06.2022 at Annexure-A has been issued under Section 36 of the Karnataka Education Act, 1983. The said provision does not mandate the requirement of a plan sanction, structural stability certificate, fire clearance etc., Section 36 dealing with the only aspect of recognition and those mentioned thereunder. The above aspects not relating to education *per se*, no Circular could have been issued under Section 36 of the said Act,.

4.2. His further submission is that once a recognition has been granted, no new conditions could be imposed during the period for which recognition is in force. In this regard he relies upon Rule (4) of the Karnataka Educational Institutions Registration Rules 1999 and submits that once the Competent Authority after verification and



satisfaction has issued a recognition under Section 36 in Form-2, the same shall be valid and subsisting for a period of ten years and during that period the question of imposing any new condition does not arise.

- 4.3. Alternatively, he submits that even if any such conditions were required to be imposed it was to be so done in terms of Clause (c) of Subsection (2) of Section 36 and any general or special conditions may be imposed in the manner prescribed and as provided for under the Act. In this regard, he refers to Subsection (24) of Section 2 of the said Act, to contend that 'prescribed' would mean as prescribed by the Rules made under the Act, and in this regard, he refers to Section 145 which confers the power on the State Government to make Rules by way of notification and as such, he submits that only the State Government can



make Rules in terms of Section 145 of the Karnataka Education Act and the Executive Authority as done in the present case could not have imposed conditions vide the impugned Circular dated 06.06.2022 at Annexure-C.

4.4. Insofar as Rule making power is concerned, he submits that any Rule framed under Section 145 of the Karnataka Education Act, ought to have been placed before both Houses of State Legislature, which can be done only after previous publication, inviting objections and after considering the objections. Thus, he submits that the petitioners have been deprived of an opportunity to place their grievances and/or their suggestions as regard the proposals to be implemented in the Circular, which has been done in a unilateral manner. Firstly, the same could not have been done by way of an executive action by way of a Circular,



secondly, it being required to be done by exercising the Rule making power under Section 145 of the Karnataka Education Act.

4.5. The Rules could be made only in respect of what is stated in Section 145 and in Section 7 of the Karnataka Education Act, no such notification having been issued either under Section 7 or Section 145, this Circular cannot stand the requirement of law and is required to be quashed.

4.6. Lastly, he submits by relying on the documents produced along with the memo filed on 02.12.2024 that the Government schools including the schools where mid-day-meal schemes are provided have not provided for or enabled fire safety measures, that the Government schools themselves have not provided the fire safety measures, the question of private unaided schools being required to



provide the same would not arise and as such, he submits that there is violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India inasmuch as the Government Schools and private schools are discriminated on the very basis as regard the same aspect.

4.7. In support of the above submissions, he relies upon the decision of Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Associated Managements of Primary and Secondary Schools in Karnataka (KAMS) Blossoms Scholl building Vs. State of Karnataka and others*** dated 14.11.2022¹ more particularly para No.9 thereof, which is reproduced hereunder for easy reference:

"9. Having taken note of the observations made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Avinash Mehrotra (supra), the order dated 15.07.2021 issued by the 2nd respondent makes a distinction with regard to newly established schools and old schools; and remaining Circulars have been issued by the Government, whereby direction is issued to

¹ WP No.5380/2022



the schools to obtain necessary NOC from competent authorities seeking renewal of the recognition/approval annually. In the light of the observation made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Avinash Mehrotra (supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that schools shall adopt the safety measures in school buildings. In this connection, having taken note of the observation made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the said case, I am of the view that the notification dated 15.07.2021 followed by endorsement dated 02.11.2021, does not survive for consideration for the reason that the respondent-authorities have not taken steps in terms of the observation made by the Hon'ble Apex Court. Respondent-authorities have issued notification arbitrarily, as the circular dated 10.11.2020 is in violation of the direction of Hon'ble Apex Court insofar as existing schools and same cannot be enforced on the schools established prior to Academic Year 2017-18, in its entirety. I also find force in the arguments advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that hardship would be caused if the guidelines are made applicable to the existing schools as per Avinash Mehrotra (supra). In this regard, statement of objections are silent and therefore, insisting the same, insofar as existing schools which are established prior to Academic Year 2017-18 is not correct and accordingly, I am of the view that the impugned circulars passed by respondent No.2, is liable to be set aside, accordingly set aside. However, in view of the submission made by the learned AGA that new notification has been issued on 06.06.2022, the measures taken by the State Government to implement direction issued as per Avinash Mehrotra's case is to be looked in its letter and spirit, as ordered by the Hon'ble Apex Court and accordingly, impugned Circular/letter dated 15.07.2021 (Annexure-G), so also, endorsement dated 02.11.2021 as per Annexure-H are liable to be set aside as the same contrary to the law declared by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforementioned case and are accordingly set aside. In the result, writ petition is allowed. However, it is open for the petitioner to challenge the notification 06.06.2022, if so advised, on the ground that,



same is contrary to the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court referred to above."

4.8. He submits that Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Avinash Mehrotra's Vs. Union of India and others***² had made a distinction between a newly established school and old schools. The said distinction will equally apply to the petitioners, the petitioner being an old school, the circular dated 06.06.2022 would only apply in respect of a school established post 04.06.2022 and not for a school which had been established prior thereto and as such, he submits that liberty having been reserved by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in WP No.5380/2022 to challenge the circular dated 06.06.2022, the same is challenged in the present proceedings.

4.9. He relies upon the decision of another Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Pragna Education Society Vs. State of***

² (2008) 6 SCC 398



Karnataka and others dated 22.09.2023 in WP No.6823/2021 more particularly para No.8 thereof, which is reproduced hereunder for easy reference:

"8. As the co-ordinate bench of this Court in W.P.No.5380/2022 (supra) has considered the dictum of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Avinash Mehrotra (supra) and held that the order dated 15.07.2021 issued by the second respondent therein makes a distinction with regard to newly established schools and old schools; and remaining circulars have been issued by the Government, whereby direction is issued to the schools to obtain necessary NOC from competent authorities seeking renewal of the recognition/approval annually and further having taken note of the observation made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Avinash Mehrotra (supra), it was further held that retrospective application of notification dated 10.11.2020, to the existing schools which are established prior to the academic year in the year 2017-18 is not correct and quashed the notification dated 10.11.2020. Further though the statement of objections filed by the State are silent in regard to the existing schools, circular dated 15.07.2021 and endorsement dated 02.11.2021 was set aside. The order is squarely applicable to the present case on hand".

4.10. By relying on **Pragna Education Society case**, he submits that the said Co-ordinate Bench has held that no new conditions could be imposed as regards a school which has already been recognised and approved.



4.11. On all the above grounds, he submits that the above petition is required to be allowed.

5. Learned Additional Government Advocate submits that,

5.1. many of the schools are old schools and it is taking into account the interest of the students, on a communication having received from the Public Works Department as regard the structural stability of the schools that one of the requirement imposed in circular dated 06.06.2022 is as regards obtaining of a structural stability certificate.

5.2. Insofar as plan sanction she submits that for any school to be established, it is but required that a plan sanction be obtained and there is new condition which has been imposed, what is being called for is production of plan sanction in respect of the building where the school is being run.



- 5.3. Insofar as fire clearance she submits that this again is a requirement under the applicable Building Bylaws and it is only that requirement which has been made known to be complied with by the schools and there is no new condition which has been imposed.
- 5.4. Insofar as the Government school not having the fire clearance, she submits that she has no instructions for the same as of now.
6. Heard Sri. S.Sudharsan, learned counsel for the petitioners and Smt. R.K. Prathibha, learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondents and perused the papers.
7. Section 36 of the Karnataka Education Act, reads as under:

" 36. Recognition.- (1) *Recognition may be accorded to any educational institution registered under this Act in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the rules made thereunder.*

(2) *The granting of recognition shall be subject to fulfillment of the following conditions, namely:-*



(a) security deposit of the prescribed amount shall be made within the time specified;

(b) the Governing Council shall possess or be assured of adequate funds to run the institution on a stable footing; and

(c) such other general or special conditions as may be prescribed in regard to accommodation, appointment of teaching and other staff, the code of conduct to be accepted and observed by the Governing Council, furniture and equipment, syllabi, text-books and such other matters relating thereto.

(3) Any local authority or Governing Council seeking recognition, as the case may be, for a local authority institution or a private educational institution shall make an application to the competent authority furnishing such particulars and in such manner and accompanied by such fee as may be prescribed.

(4) The competent authority after satisfying itself that the application is in accordance with the rules, may dispose the application in accordance with sub-sections (6) to (8), or if deemed necessary forward the application to the expert body for obtaining its report under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 37.

(5) The expert body receiving the application forwarded under sub-section (4) shall return it to the competent authority along with its report within such time as may prescribed.

(6) The competent authority, after considering the report, if any, received from the expert body and after holding such inspection or enquiry as it may deem necessary shall, by order, in writing,-

(a) grant recognition, where the conditions for recognition applicable to such institutions are fulfilled; or

(b) grant approval provisionally subject to the fulfillment of the conditions for recognition within a



period specified or extended from time to time by such authority:

Provided that the educational institution shall not admit any fresh batch of students during the period of such provisional approval.

(7) If a period is specified or extended under sub-clause (b) of sub-section (6), the competent authority may immediately after the expiry of such period, obtain from the expert body, a report or a further report under section 37. The competent authority, after considering the report or the further report, if any, and holding such inspection or enquiry as may be deemed necessary shall, by order in writing grant recognition where all the conditions for recognition applicable to such institutions are fulfilled or for reasons to be recorded in writing, refuse recognition where such conditions are not fulfilled:

Provided that recognition shall not be so refused unless the applicant is given an opportunity of being heard.

(8) Every order of grant or refusal of recognition passed under this section shall be communicated to the registering authority and to the applicant."

8. A perusal of Section 36 of the Karnataka Education Act, 1983 would indicate that the same relates to the recognition that may be accorded to any educational institution. The conditions of the recognition, the aspects that would be considered for recognition have been detailed thereunder.



9. The Form of application is to be made in terms of the Rule 3 of the Karnataka Educational Institutions Registration Rules 1999, one of the requirements under Item-14 of the said Form-1 is to provide the details of the accommodation, the total area of the school building, Number of rooms/size, total area of play ground, toilet which have been provided etc. In terms of Rule 3, the documents in support of the contents of the Form are also required to be uploaded on the IT Portal of the Karnataka Education Department. It is after satisfaction of all the requirements that in terms of Clause (a) of Rule 6, a certificate is issued in terms of Form-2 requiring the applicant to fulfill all the general conditions as stipulated in Rules 4 and 5 thereof.
10. Rule 4 of the Karnataka Educational Institutions (classification, regulation and prescription of curricula etc.,) Rules, 1995, is reproduced hereunder for easy reference:



"4. General regulations relating to buildings of educational institutions.- No educational institution or Part thereof shall function in a building, unless,-

(a) it is located in healthy and sanitary surroundings;

Rules under the Karnataka Education Act 7

(b) it is built with safe roof and structure;

(c) it is built in such a way as to ensure sufficient air and light both inside the classrooms and in the staircase, corridors and alleys;

(d) the height of the building from the floor to the ceiling in each storey is more than eight feet;

(e) it is of not more than seven storeys from the ground level;

(f) where it is of more than one floor from the ground level, safe and proper staircases are provided;

(g) where it is of more than three storeys from the ground level, proper and safe lift facility is provided;

(h) it is not used in any part of the day, week, month or year, for any purpose other than for the furtherance of education;"

11. In terms of the Clause (b) of Sub-Rule (1) of Rule (4), it is mandatory that good building, facilities sufficient accommodation with water, toilet and other facilities are made available. Thus, it is clear that at the time of recognition is granted, all the



requirements as regards the building are required to be satisfied by the school.

12. In this regard the learned Additional Government Advocate would submit that when the permission is granted, an inspection of the site is made and conditions are imposed on the Governing council of a school for which recognition has been granted to post facto comply with requirement of the Rules by obtaining all the necessary permissions, sanctions etc., within a period of one year in terms of Clause (E) Sub-Rule (3) of Rule 4 requiring all the infrastructure facilities to be made available within one year of the provisional recognition and the play ground, etc, to be provided within three years of the provisional recognition being granted. She submits that it is after the above that the recognition is granted and it is this recognition that learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted would be applicable



for the period of ten years and during that period no new condition could be imposed.

13. Unfortunately, as can be seen the Education Department is granting provisional recognition before the requirements under the Rules are complied with by providing a timeframe of one year for compliance. However, even as regard the said compliance, there is no methodology which has been established by the Education Department to ensure whether those conditions have been complied with or not and without such compliance Education Department has been issuing recognition to the schools and no documents are collected by the concerned Authorities after the provisional recognition is issued at the time of grant of final recognition.
14. This aspect has also resulted in the above situation inasmuch as the plan sanction which is required to be obtained by the schools has still not been furnished to the Authority requiring the present



impugned circular dated 06.06.2022 to be issued. In fact if, all the requirements of the Rules were to be followed which would indicate that the Building Bylaws and or the applicable Bylaws/Rules of the Local Authorities have to be fulfilled by the school. Those permissions and sanctions were to be obtained by the school and ought to have been submitted to the concerned Authority before the final recognition is issued.

15. Though Sri. S. Sudharsan, learned counsel has contended that the requirement of issuing of structural stability certificate, the plan sanction or fire clearance had been imposed only in year 2022 after the recognition had been granted which is in force for a period of ten years, I am of the considered opinion that by way of the circular, what has been sought for is only what was required to the satisfied by the schools even before the final recognition was issued, that is to say that the school



ought to satisfy the Authorities, that the structure of the building is stable and can cater to the activities that are performed therein, more so when the school is a place where children of young age who cannot be easily trained in respect of any disaster or emergency issue which could arise.

16. Insofar as the plan sanction is concerned, it was but required for the schools to have obtained a plan sanction from the concerned Authorities, even before schools were to be started since no building could be constructed without a plan sanction having been issued by the concerned Authority whether in the urban or rural area depending on the concerned plan sanctioning Authority designated in that particular area.
17. Insofar as fire clearance is concerned that again is an integral part of the plan sanction approval process, wherever any occupancy certificate or completion certificate is required to be issued by the concerned



Municipal Authority, the said Authority would have to take into consideration, if all requirements under the building Bylaws, national building code or the like are satisfied which in this case could include the fire safety equipment to be installed in the schools. Again as aforesaid, large number of young children would be using the school and their interests have to be protected.

18. Thus, I am unable to accept the submission of Sri. S. Sudharsan, learned counsel that new conditions have been imposed. In my considered opinion the circular has been issued only to verify the implementation of the building Bylaws and other regulations which were always applicable to the schools of the petitioners and there is no new conditions which have been imposed. Since there is no new condition imposed the question of referring to powers under Section 36 or Rules being made in the prescribed manner in terms of Sub Section (24) of



Section 2 as relating to items mentioned in Section 7 and Section 145 could not arise, since this is not a new requirement which is imposed, but only compliance with the applicable laws, which compliance was always the obligation of the school. The grant of recognition under the Education Act would not substitute the requirement of any other law in force, a school is always required to follow all other applicable laws and cannot take a defence that the grant of recognition will absolve such requirement.

19. For the very same reason the judgment of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Associated Managements of Primary and Secondary Schools in Karnataka (KAMS) Vs. State of Karnataka and others***³ dated 14.11.2022 supra would not be applicable, since in that matter the aspect of

³ W.P.No.5380/2022



applicability of the building Bylaws for the school and inspection has not been considered.

20. Insofar as the decision in ***Pragna Education Society's*** case is concerned that was a case where a notification had been made retrospectively applicable and as such, this Court came to a conclusion that no notification would be applied retrospectively.
21. In the present case, as observed supra the requirements under the circular dated 06.06.2022 has not imposed a new condition or a new condition not been made applicable retrospectively. These requirements were always required to be complied with by the schools.
22. Lastly, one of the important submissions which was made by Sri. S.Srudhsan, learned counsel is that the requirement of circular applicable to private schools which are unaided are not applicable and are not adhered to by the Government schools this appears to be a major lacuna which is required to be



addressed by the State Government. When the State imposes certain rules, regulations and obligations to be followed by private individuals or organizations, the State and or its entities if involved in the very same activity are also duty-bound to follow such rules, regulations and obligations as imposed on private individuals or organisations. The requirement of applicable laws including Building Bye-laws, National Building Code would equally be applicable to the State Government which would be required to be complied with by and fulfilled by State Government. There is no particular exemption for the State Government.

23. Infact, I am of the considered opinion that the Government has to act as a model citizen and to comply with all applicable rules which it requires a private citizen to comply. Hence, the Principal Secretary Education Department is directed to look into this aspect and formulate a detailed action plan



and submit a detailed project plan as regards the manner in which the Government schools will comply with the various legal requirements which are applicable to private schools aided or unaided.

24. Taking into consideration that the petitioners-schools have been running for several years and compliance with some of the requirements will take some time. Taking into consideration that they are rendering yeomen service of providing education for the students, suitable time would have to be granted to the petitioner to comply with all the requirements, more so taking into account that there would also be financial investment which is required to be made. Hence, time is granted until the commencement of the next academic year for the schools to comply with the requirements under the local municipal laws, building Bylaws and all laws, rules and regulations which are applicable to the said school.



25. The Principal Secretary Education Department is also directed to create an IT portal on his website indicating the details of the compliances which are required to be made by each of the schools under each of the particular enactments applicable to the said school, conditions imposed in the provisional recognition or the like, enabling the school to upload the compliances made from time to time. For example, if a plan were to be secured for modification or otherwise as and when the same is secured to be uploaded on to the website. A suitable system to enable the school to upload the said plan sanction onto the website to be implemented. The said portal to also be connected with all concerned departments/organisations/authorities by using an Application Programming Interface (API) or the like so that all permissions and sanctions relating a particular school at a particular location can be automatically secured from such authority and polpulated into the portal and/or when any document



is uploaded the authenticity and veracity of the document can be checked.

26. A detailed project report in respect thereto, to be placed on record within a period of six weeks from today.
27. With the above observations, the petition stands **disposed.**
28. Though the above petition is disposed relist on **04.03.2025** to enable the Principal Secretary to comply with the above directions.

Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

TMP
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 7
CT: BHK