



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 32051 of 2025

Teachers Association Madaris Arabia And 2 Others
.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

National Human Rights Commission And 8 Others
.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Hritudhwaj Pratap Sahi, Mohammad
Ali Ausaf, Prashant Shukla, Sr.
Advocate

Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C., Pranav Mishra, Satyam Singh

Court No. - 2

**HON'BLE ATUL SREEDHARAN, J.
HON'BLE VIVEK SARAN, J.**

(Per : Hon'ble Vivek Saran, J.)

1. I had the opportunity to go through the order dictated by brother Justice Atul Sreedharan on 27th April, 2026. The order was dictated when the petitioner's counsel had asked for an adjournment while making a mention. The petitioner, definitely, was not arguing the case. There was even no representation of the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC). The only party opposing the adjournment during the mentioning was the State counsel.

2. I am strictly of the opinion that if any order touching on the merits of the case or even touching on the role of the NHRC had to be passed, then all parties concerned ought to have been heard.

3. I am also conscious of the fact that a writ court can pass an order even in the absence of any particular party, however, in the instant case, when in Paragraph Nos. 6 and 7, certain definite observations were being made, then it would have been in the fitness of things that parties were properly represented in the Court. In the absence of the parties, no adverse observations were required.

4. Since, various facts have been mentioned in paragraph nos. 6 and 7, with which I do not agree, I differ from the order as has been dictated by brother Justice Atul Sreedharan. However, I am in agreement with the adjournment being allowed.

(Vivek Saran,J.)

April 27, 2026
Jaideep/-