



\$~54.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ LPA 240/2026 & CM APPL. 22800/2026, CM APPL. 22801/2026
SATYA PRAKASH RAVIDASAppellant

Through: Appellant in person

versus

THE REGISTRAR OF SOCIETIES & ANR.Respondent
Through: Mr. Anil Dutt, Mr. Anupam
Choudhary and Ms. Lavi Agarwal,
Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER
09.04.2026

%

1. Heard the appellant who appears in person, Mr. Sannu, learned counsel representing the respondent No.1 and Mr. Anil Dutt, learned counsel representing the respondent No.2.
2. Having regard to the averments made in the application, the delay of 28 days in filing the LPA has sufficiently been explained. The application i.e. CM APPL. 22801/2026 is accordingly allowed and the delay in filing the LPA is hereby condoned.
3. By instituting the proceedings of this intra court appeal, a challenge has been made to the judgment dated 02.02.2026, passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C) 15987/2025, which was filed by the appellant.
4. The prayers made by the appellant while instituting the proceedings of



W.P.(C) 15987/2025 is quoted in paragraph 16 of the impugned judgment which is quoted hereinbelow:

"(a) Issue a writ, order, or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondents to produce before this Hon'ble Court the resolution(s) passed in the Governing Body meetings of Raj Vidya Kender (RVK), together with all records relating to the erstwhile society Divine United Organisation (DUO) and its subsequent change of name to RVK on 07.07.2003, including full particulars of all immovable and movable properties of DUO that were allegedly transferred, vested, or otherwise dealt with under RVK.

(b). In the alternative, if the Respondents fail, neglect, or refuse to produce such records, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to direct Respondent No.1 (Registrar of Societies, NCT of Delhi) to conduct a statutory enquiry under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 into the affairs of Respondent No. 2 (RVK), and to take consequential action, including cancellation of registration, if violations of the Act are established. "

5. A persual of the prayer clause of the writ petition instituted by the appellant reveals that what all was prayed by him before the learned Single Judge was that a direction be issued to the respondents to produce before the Court certain documents, which are in the custody of the Registrar of Societies.

6. The learned Single Judge, referring to Section 19 of the Societies Registration Act, 1860, has observed in the impugned judgment that the appellant can take recourse to the provisions of Section 19 not only for inspection of documents, but also for taking certain copies of the documents. Section 19 of the Societies Registration Act, 1980 is quoted hereinbelow:

"19. Inspection of documents, Certified copies.—Any person may inspect all documents filed with the Registrar under this Act on payment of a fee of one rupee for each inspection; and



any person may require a copy or extract of any document or any part of any document, to be certified by the Registrar, on payment of two annas for every hundred words of such copy or extract; and such certified copy shall be prima facie evidence of the matters therein contained in all legal proceedings whatever.”

7. A perusal of the aforequoted provisions reveal that the documents in the custody of Registrar of the Societies can be inspected by any person on payment of a certain fee. It further provides that any person may require a copy or extract of any document or any part of any document, to be certified by the Registrar, on payment of the fee as given thereunder.

8. Accordingly, the learned Single Judge, while disposing of the underlying writ petition has observed that the appellant can inspect the documents with the Registrar and obtain certified copies or extracts thereof.

9. We are of the opinion that the learned Single Judge has taken a correct view in the matter and has rightly disposed of W.P.(C) 15987/2025, and the impugned judgment so far as it relates to disposal of W.P.(C) 15987/2025 is concerned, does not, in our opinion, call for any interference by this Court.

10. Resultantly, the appeal is dismissed.

11. No order as to costs.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

APRIL 9, 2026

N.Khanna