



\$~95

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2390/2026, CM APPL. 11658/2026**

AJAY PRAKASH SHRIVASTAVAPetitioner

Through: **Mr. Ravi Ranjan, Adv.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: **Ms Arti Bansal CGSC with Ms.
Shruti Goel advocate**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

% **19.02.2026**

CM APPL. 11659/2026

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 2390/2026

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:

“(i) Issue a Writ of or any other appropriate Writ thereby directing the respondent No. 2, Canara Bank, to immediately freeze Bank Account No. 1098101100603 opened in the name of “Spiritual Regeneration Movement Foundation of India” and illegally operated by Respondents No. 3 to 5.

(ii) Direct the respondent No. 1 and 2 to initiate appropriate penal proceedings against Respondents No. 3 to 5 for their fraudulently act of opening the bank account of the name of the



petitioner by using forged and fabricated documents including PAN.

(iii) Direct Respondent No. 2 to furnish full account statements, KYC documents, and all records relating to the opening and operation of the said illegal bank account...”

2. The prayers in the present petition emanate from the petitioner’s contention that the petitioner is the actual “Spiritual Regeneration Movement Foundation of India”, a society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 and respondent Nos. 3 to 5 have wrongly opened an account in the name of “Spiritual Regeneration Movement Foundation of India” and are operating the said account.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is the General Secretary of the Spiritual Regeneration Movement Foundation of India.

4. The question concerning the fact whether the petitioner, namely Mr. Ajay Prakash Shrivastava or respondent Nos. 3 to 5 are the office bearers of aforesaid society are disputed questions of fact which requires detailed evidence and cannot be adjudicated in the writ jurisdiction.

5. The fact whether the account can be opened by respondent Nos. 3 to 5 under the name of aforesaid society is a corollary question which will be determined after the determination of the question whether Mr. Ajay Prakash Shrivastava or respondent Nos. 3 to 5 are actual office bearers of society.

6. At this stage, Mr. Ranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present petition with liberty to file a civil suit on the same cause of action.



7. Granting the said liberty, the petition is disposed of.
8. This Court has not commented on the merits/demerits of the present petition.

JASMEET SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 19, 2026/DM