```
\220[CP(C) 82/15]
  1
                               COURT NO.3
  ITEM NO.1+31
                                                             SECTION PIL(W)
                    SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
                              RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
    CONMT.PET.(C) No.82/2015 In W.P.(C) No.631/2004
  HARIJAN MAHILA (NGO) & ORS
                                                             Petitioner(s)
                                        VERSUS
  HEERA LAL GUPTA
                                                             Respondent(s)
  (With appln.(s)
                        for directions and
                                                      exemption from
                                                                           filing
  impleadment and office report)
  WITH CONMT. PET.(C) No.27/2016 In W.P.(C) No.631/2004
  (With appln.(s) for filing addl. paper(s) and appln.(s) for
  directions and appln.(s) for impleadment and office report)
  CONMT. PET.(C) No.464/2016 In W.P.(C) No.631/2004
  (With office report)
  Date: 04/10/2016 These petitions were called on for hearing today.
  CORAM :
              HON' BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPAK MISRA
              HON' BLE MR. JUSTICE UDAY UMESH LALIT
  For Petitioner(s) Mr. Prashant Shukla, Adv.
  Mr. Vishnu Shankar Jain, Adv.
  Mr. K. Paremashwar, Adv.
                      Ms. Abha R. Sharma, AOR
  CP(C) 27/16 & Mr. K. Parameshwar, Adv.
  CP(C) 464/16 Mr. Prashant Shukla, Adv.
  Mr. Vishnu Shankar Jain, Adv.
  Mr. Satyajeet Kumar, AOR
  For Respondent(s)
                      Mr. Aftab Ali Khan, AOR
                       Mr. Ravi Prakash Mehrotra, AOR
                       Mr. Satyajeet Kumar, AOR
  Dr. Rajeev Sharma, AOR
  Mr. Ram Anugrah Singh, Adv.
  Mr. Robin Babu, Adv.
CP(C) 82/15
2
Mr. M.R. Shamshad, AOR
Mr. Andleeb Naqvi, Adv.
Mr. Vaibhav Yadadv, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Samaddar, Adv.
Ms. Harshita Deshwal, Adv.
               UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
                                     ORDER
                  on 19 th
  This
          Court
                   2016, had passed
    September,
  following order:-
  ⬠S As this matter relates to State of U.P., let it
  be
      listed on 4th October, 2016, along with
  connected matters. ⬠\235
  Mr. K. Parameshwar, learned counsel appearing for
the petitioner has submitted that the three districts
intends to verify are, Allahabad, Kaushambi and Fatehp
                                                     Kaushambi and Fatehpur.
  Learned counsel appearing for the State of U.P. has submitted
         they are not the adjacent districts and,
  petitioner in the guise of this prayer intends to sustain the
  prayer for appointment. Mr. Parameshwar, learned counsel for
the petitioner submits that though there is a prayer seeking
  appointment, he does not intend to press the same.
  At this juncture, Mr. M.R. Shamshad, learned counsel
              for the State of U.P. has submitted that when the
  appearing
appearing for the State of U.P. has submitted to districts are not adjacent, it may be difficult. him to choose one district. On a consensus, the district of Allahabad has been selected. Certain Upper Primary Primary Schools of the district have to be veri
                                                                              We asked
                                                                      verified
                                                                                   by
```

Committee. At this juncture, Mr. Parameshwar has attention to paragraph 9 of the judgment rendered Environment & Consumer Protectin Foundation vs Delhi Administration and Others [W.P.(C) No.631 of 2004]. Paragraph 9 of the said judgment reads as follows:-

CP(C) 82/15 ân S 9. We are, inclined to dispose of this Writ Petition with a direction to all the States to give effect to the various directions already given by this Court like providing toilet facilities for boys and girl, drinking water facilities, sufficient class rooms, appointment of teaching and non-teaching staff etc., if not already provided, within six months from today. We make it clear that these directions are applicable to all the schools, whether State owned or privately owned, aided or unaided, minority or non-minority. As the writ petition is disposed of the schools are applicable to all the schools, whether State owned or privately owned, aided or unaided, is disposed of, no orders are required to be passed on applications for intervention and impleadment and the same are disposed of.⬠\235 Mr. Parameshwar has also drawn our attention order dated 12 th

March, 2012, which has been incorporated in paragraph 6 of the said judgment. It reads as follows:- â¬S The Chief Secretaries of various States were direct to ensure that separate permanent toilets for boys and girls are constructed in all the schools respective States on or before 31st March, 2012 and in Mr. Parameshwar has also drawn our attention to the March, 2012, which has been incorporated in $\hat{a} \neg$ S The Chief Secretaries of various States were directed girls are constructed in all the schools in their case it was not possible to construct permanent toilets, then at least temporary toilet facilities were directed to be made available on or before 28 th February, 2012 and it was directed than an affidavit to that effect shall be filed by the Chief Secretaries on or before 28th February, 2012. In pursuance of the aforesaid directions
Court, affidavits have been filed by the States
Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Meghalaya, Mizoram,
Chhattisgarh, Punjab, Nagaland, West Bengal, A
Pradesh, Maharashtra, Uttarakhand, Odhisha, Karnataka,
Jharkhand, Himachal Pradesh, Goa, Municiapl Corporation
of Delhi and the Union Territory of
These States/union Territories in their re directions of Chhattisgarh, Punjab, Nagaland, West Bengal, Andhra of Delhi and the Union Territory of Lakshadweep. These States/union Territories in their respective affidavits have indicated that they have either constructed the toilets for boys and girls or they would complete it before the stipulated date that is before 31st March, 2012. According to the Office Report dated 3rd day March, 2012, following States have not filed their affidavits:

drawn

CP(C) 82/15

- 1. Tripura
- 2. Tamil Nadu
- Sikkim
- 4. Gujarat

7. Jammu and Kashmir
8. Madhya Pradesh
9. Kerala
In the interest of justice, we grant one more opportunity to these States to file their respective affidavits within two weeks from today, failing which the Chief Secretary of the State concerned shall remain present in this Court on the next date of hearing. No

This is a True Copy of the court records online ***

```
further time shall be granted.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation has handed affidavit of Sujoy Mojumdar, Director (Water
   of Drinking Water and Sanitation has handed over an
   affidavit of Sujoy Mojumdar, Director (Water),
   Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Government
   of India. In the affidavit it is mentioned to under the â¬STotal Sanitation Campaignâ¬\235 (TSC), the Central Government supplements the efforts of the States in providing sanitation facilities in the rural areas, including identified existing rural
                                                                                             mentioned that
   Government schools and Anganwadis by providing them
   with financial assistance and technical support. It is
   further submitted in the affidavit that under the TSC,
   at present, School Sanitation Hygiene
   Programme is operational in 607 districts spread across
   30 States and Union Territories and a total
   11,99,117 school toilets have been financially assisted
   under the TSC. The cumulative progress of school
   toilets unit blocks financially assisted under the TSC
   in the entire country till 29.2.2012 are as follows:
   Project Objectives - 13,14,636
Project Performance - 11,99,117
Percentage-wise progress - 93
                                                                  91.21%
   In paragraph 9 of the said affidavit it is stated
In paragraph 9 of the said affidavit it is stated that provision of sanitation facility in Government schools is made by States within their TSC allocation.

Out of the total of Rs.3068.51 crore approved for School Sanitation under TSC, s.2268.28 crore (cumulative) has been reported as expenditure utilized by the States. The State-wise details of financial progress and utilization under TSC till
  School Sanitation under TSC, s.2268.28 crore (cumulative) has been reported as expenditure at utilized by the States. The State-wise details of financial progress and utilization under TSC till
   CP(C) 82/15
   29.2.2012 are tabulated and enclosed along
                                                                                         with
   affidavit.
   In paragraph 10 of the affidavit it is mentioned that
  as per information provided by the Department of School Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, the number of Government schools
as per School Resource with sa District 2010-11 i Total Num Gover
   with sanitation facility available, as per their
   District Information System for Education (DISE)
   2010-11 is as under:
   Total Number of Govt. Schools
         Government Schools with Girls Toilet - 6,24,074
                                                                    8,24,605
   Government Schools with Boys/
   Common Toilet
   Let copies of this affidavit be supplied by the
   Registry to the learned counsel appearing for the
   States/Union Territories within one week from
   today.
Mr. Ravindra Bana, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that after this dealt with the problem of electricity, potable drinking water and toilets for boys and girls in the Government schools, the other main problem which is spersistent in most of the schools is teachers and infrastructure. In order to ecompliance of Article 21A of the Constitution
   of the petitioner submits that after this Court
  schools, the other main problem which is still persistent in most of the schools is regarding teachers and infrastructure. In order to ensure compliance of Article 21A of the Constitution, it imperative that schools must have qualified teachers
   and basic infrastructure.
   Learned counsel appearing on behalf of National University for Educational Planning and
                                                                                                         the
   Education undertakes to file a comprehensive affidavit giving therein up-to-date position about
affidavit giving therein up-
the availability of teachers
schools.

Let a comprehensive affice
the States/Union Territories re
This is a True Copy of the court records online. Au
                                                                            infrastructure
                                                              and
                                                    affidavit be
                                                                                       filed
                                                                                                      by all
   the States/Union Territories regarding teachers and
```

infrastructure in schools within three weeks today, with an advance copy to the learned counsel the counsel for the for the petitioner and States/Union Territories.⬠\235 It is urged by Mr. Parameshwar that despite the aforesaid stand taken by the State of U.P., nothing has been CP(C) 82/15 done. In view of the aforesaid, we appoint the Committee consisting of Mr. Ashok Gupta, learned senior counsel as the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Gaurav Agarwal and Mr. Sankaranarayanan, learned counsel as the Members of the Committee, to go to the district of Allahabad and submit us a report in the lines of the directions given for the State of Telangana. Needless to say, the State administration shall provide all the facilities to the members of the Committee and their fees shall be paid by the State. Mr. Shamshad, learned counsel for the Sate of U.P. shall discuss with the Committee members and determine the fees. The Committee shall initiate the visit within two weeks hence and, thereafter, submit an interim report within four weeks. The petitioner is at liberty to give a list of the Upper Primary and Primary schools to the members of the Committee. Let the matter be listed on 28 th