



\$~85

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

+ **W.P.(C) 18548/2025**

ADITYA VIKRAM NEWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Himanshu Upadhyay, Advocate.**

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: **None.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

08.12.2025

%

CM APPL. 77070/2025

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 18548/2025

3. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

“a) Issue a Writ of Mandamus to the Respondent No.1 Reserve Bank of India to initiate regulatory action against the Respondent No.2 for arbitrary enhancement of interest rates, Switch Fee demands against the established Norms;

b) Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing Respondent No.2 to restore the rules, policy and original contracted ROI of 6.25% p.a. (External bench mark rate plus spread of 2.25%) on loan account and to refund/adjust all sums illegally collected in the name of Switch Fee along with appropriate interest.”

4. It is clearly evident from the memo of parties as also the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition that the Petitioner is a resident of Panchkula, Haryana and the cause of action is against Respondent No. 2



which is in Mumbai. Accordingly, this Court has no territorial jurisdiction to entertain this writ petition.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the Petitioner, on instructions, seeks to withdraw this writ petition to approach the Competent Court.

6. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of with liberty as prayed for, making it clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of this case.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 8, 2025/YA