



\$~61

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2933/2026 & CM APPL. 14141/2026**

ASHOK ARORA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Krishan Kumar and Mr. Anubhav
Kumar, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Sameer Vashisht, Standing
Counsel (Civil) GNCTD with Ms.
Vaishali Gupta, Adv.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

% **09.03.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed by the Petitioner- Ashok Arora under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, assailing the order dated 3rd October, 2025 passed by Financial Commissioner, Delhi (hereinafter, '*impugned order*') in **Revision Petition No. 100 of 2025**. Vide the impugned order, the revision petition filed by the Petitioner has been dismissed.
3. A perusal of the said impugned order would show that the Financial Commissioner has dismissed the revision petition on the ground that the Petitioner was represented by the Court Clerk of the Counsel and there was no proper representation on behalf of the Petitioner on the said date.
4. The background of the present petition is that the Petitioner had sought



certain information from the Respondent No. 3- The New Progressive CGHS Ltd. (hereinafter, 'Society'). The Society is stated to have responded to the same but the Petitioner was not satisfied. Thereafter, the Petitioner approached the RCS and the Assistant Registrar passed a detailed order on 4th April, 2025. This order dated 4th April, 2025 was challenged before the Financial Commissioner. The Revision was dismissed on the ground that the Petitioner was not duly represented before the FC.

5. Heard. A perusal of the order shows that the Petitioner was represented through the counsel's court clerk – which was clearly not permissible. The Financial Commissioner rightly dismissed the revision petition. Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner submits that earlier a different date was given in the matter and the same was changed by the FC unilaterally, which then led to the Ld. Counsel's absence. The same was not deliberate.

6. This Court is of the opinion that since the dispute between the Petitioner and the Society still remains unresolved, it is deemed appropriate to remand the matter back to the Financial Commissioner, subject to a cost of Rs. 5000/- to be deposited by the Petitioner, with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee. The bank details of the Delhi High Court Legal Service Committee are as under:

- **Name: Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee**
- **Account No: 15530110008386**
- **IFSC Code: UCBA0001553**
- **Bank and Branch: UCO Bank, Delhi High Court**

7. The same shall be deposited within a period of two weeks.

8. The revision petition is restored back to its number before the Financial Commissioner. The Petitioner and the Society shall appear before the



Financial Commissioner on 13th April, 2026.

9. The proof of payment of costs shall be placed before the Financial Commissioner on the said date. The Financial Commissioner shall proceed in accordance with law.

10. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

MADHU JAIN, J.

MARCH 9, 2026/ys/ck