

Recommendations of the Commission is prepared and placed on flag 'A' for Concurrence.

31.12

Chairman (Incharge) 386
31/12

Issue order

Due to clerical and typical mistakes in historical part of the recommendation it is corrected and being issued

Due to clerical and typical mistakes in historical part of the recommendation it is corrected and being issued

← Approved copy from flag 'A'

Before the Maharashtra State Commission for
Protection of Child Rights.

Complaint under Section 14(1) of Commission for
Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005 read with section
31(1)(b) of Right to Education Act 2009

Case No.216 / 2014-15

Dr. Vikas Motewar ... Applicants

V/s

Lokhandwala Foundation School ... Respondent

Background

This matter came before the Commission under provision of Right to Education Act by Complainant Shri. Dr. Vikas Motewar against Lokhandwala Foundation School.

2. The Commission took the cognizance, issued notices to respondents. Hearing conducted on 25/9/2014. Parties were present. Heard the matter. Respondent requested for time. Complainant has prayed to pass the order so that child may get admission. Time granted to respondent. Matter is listed on next hearing i.e. on 8/10/2014.

3. Complainant and education officer were present on 8/10/2014 but school's authority did not appear before the Commission on 8/10/2014. The Commission heard the matter and decided to place this matter for final order. On 10/8/2014 school's reply has been received pertaining to non appearance before the Commission, raising issue for non receiving notice in time, and sought further date. On 16/10/2014, a detail reply alongwith evidentry documents filed by the school, has been, received in the office of Commission.

4. In the reply the chronologies of the incidents have been mentioned. The school's reply shows that school has tried to pursue the parents to send child ^{Dwva} ~~Dhruva~~ in the school. However parents did not give any heed in this regard. Merely citing the family problem without giving any valid and reasonable reasons does not establish that in action and act of omission, as committed by the parents was genuine and reasonable.

5. After going through the contents of reply and documents placed before the Commission. It is not appearing that school has violated the provision of R.T.E. Act 2009. Therefore this matter is disposed of without any recommendation.

By order and seal of the Commission.

Date : 31-12



31 DEC 2014

(A.N.Tripathi)
I.F.S.
Secretary

Maharashtra state commission for
protection of child rights