

Gaikwad RD

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.373 OF 2023**

Rajesh Tanna	...Petitioner
<i>Versus</i>	
Reserve Bank of India	
Through its Secretary & Ors	...Respondents

Mr Karl Tamboly, *with Bindi Dave, Kashish Mainkar & Jyoti Pardeshi i/b Wadia Ghandy & Co, for the Petitioner.*
Ms Aditi Pathak, *with Kirti Ojha, Parag Sharma, Vijay Salokhe i/b BLAC Co, for Respondent No.1-RBI.*
Mr Janak Dwarkadas, *with Pranav Sampat, Ritvik Kulkarni & Isha Srivastava i/b Khaitan & Co, for Respondent No.2.*
Ms Priyanka Chavan, *for Respondent No.3-UOI.*

**CORAM G.S. Patel &
 Neela Gokhale, JJ.**
DATED: 3rd April 2023

PC:-

1. The Petition is, in our view, without substance. The Petitioner claims to be interested in ensuring compliance by his former employer, the 2nd Respondent Bank, with Reserve Bank of India (“**RBI**”) regulations. He has complained about his own employer.

2. His chief complaint is that the RBI, the 1st Respondent, has not taken him seriously for a variety of reasons.

3. As an employee, the Petitioner has no legally enforceable or constitutional right to demand that the RBI *must* act on his complaint. The RBI has no such obligation. We do not expect the RBI to act on every single complaint that comes to it. If there be merit in any complaint, we have every confidence that the RBI will do what is necessary according to its rules, guidelines, and policies. It is, after all, the top regulator in the banking industry and there is nothing to suggest that it does not take its role seriously (to the contrary, in fact).

4. Nothing is shown to persuade us that we must compel the RBI to consider a complaint it does not think meritorious. The Petitioner himself is unaffected one way or the other.

5. The Petition is rejected.

(Neela Gokhale, J)

(G. S. Patel, J)

RAJU
DATTATRAYA
GAIKWAD
Digitally signed
by RAJU
DATTATRAYA
GAIKWAD
Date:
2023.04.05
15:47:38
+0530