



\$~22

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 12330/2024, CM APPL. 71349/2024 & CM APPL. 71350/2024**

VIJAY GUPTAPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

Versus

RBI OMBUDSMAN & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhinav Sharma with Mr. Dipan Sethi and Mr. Snehashish, Advocates for respondent No.1.
Mr. Sumit Geol with Ms. Sreeparna Basak and Ms. Apurba Pattanayak, Advocates for respondent No.2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

% **ORDER**
09.01.2025

1. At the very outset, learned counsel for respondent No.1/RBI Ombudsman submits that Ombudsman shall consider the representation of the petitioner afresh without getting influenced by its earlier decision. He also states that if Ombudsman thinks it appropriate, it would also see whether opportunity of any personal hearing is required to be given to the petitioner or not.
2. Petitioner, who appears in person, submits that in view of the above, he does not press the present petition. He, however, states that the above said exercise may be made time-bound. He also seeks liberty



to revive the proceedings in case the result still remains the same.

3. In view of the above and after taking inputs from learned counsel for the respondent No.1/RBI Ombudsman, the present petition is disposed of as not pressed. Simultaneously, the Ombudsman is requested to consider the representation afresh within a period of four weeks from today.

4. Needless to say, in case the Ombudsman feels any requirement of giving any personal hearing to the petitioner, it would afford such opportunity to the petitioner.

5. The petition is disposed of as not pressed. Liberty, as prayed, is granted.

6. Copy of this order be also given Dasti under the signatures of the Court Master.

MANOJ JAIN, J

JANUARY 9, 2025
st