

\$~51

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 9263/2018

SNEHALAYA CHARITABLE TRUST REPRESENTED
THROUGH: ITS MANAGING TRUSTEE Petitioner
Through: Mr. G. Tushar Rao, Mr. Mayank
Sharma and C.M. Jaykumar,
Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narula, Mr. Abhishek
Ghai, Mr. Rajat Gava and Mr. S.
Kumar Shukla, Advocates for
R1/UIO.
Ms. Divya Singh, Advocate for SBI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

04.09.2018

CM Appln. No.35784/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) No.9263/2018

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:

“a. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondent no. 1 to grant Requisite approval / permission to Respondent No.2 with respect to release of the Second Installment of the Foreign

contribution fund has received from the donor of petitioner trust.”

4. It is averred that the petitioner is in process of constructing a home for destitute and mentally challenged women. It is stated that the petitioner had secured a donation from overseas for the said project. The petitioner had also applied for the necessary approvals from respondent no.1. It is stated that funds have been received by respondent no.2. It is further stated that the first instalment has been disbursed but the second instalment cannot be disbursed without necessary approvals from respondent no.1. It is in this context that the petitioner has filed the present petition.

5. This Court is informed that the petitioner had made a representation to the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs on 13.02.2018 and 24.02.2018.

5. In view of the above, this Court considers it apposite to dispose of the present petition by directing respondent no.1 to take a decision with regard to the said representation and communicate the same as expeditiously as possible and in any event, within a period of three weeks from today. It is so directed. Needless to state that if the petitioner is aggrieved by the decision of respondent no.1, the petitioner would be at liberty to apply.

6. Order *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

SEPTEMBER 04, 2018

dr