



\$~2 & 3

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

+ W.P.(C) 4819/2026 & CM APPL. 23634/2026

ARVIND KUMAR BISHNOI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Rajsekhar Rao, Mr. Suhrith
Parathasarthi, Mr MV Mukunda, Ms
Yashmita Pandey, Ms Amritha
Satyajith & Ms. Rashmi Nandkumar,
Advs.

versus

ICICI BANK LTD

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sumit Goel, Ms. Sreeparna
Basak, Ms. Swati Bharadwaj, Ms.
Akshita Dogra & Mr. Akhil Shrestha,
Advs. for ICICI Bank.

3

+ W.P.(C) 4879/2026 & CM APPL. 23985/2026

AMITA BISHNOI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Rajsekhar Rao, Mr. Suhrith
Parathasarthi, Mr MV Mukunda, Ms
Yashmita Pandey, Ms Amritha
Satyajith & Ms. Rashmi Nandkumar,
Advs.

versus

ICICI BANK LTD.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sumit Goel, Ms. Sreeparna
Basak, Ms. Swati Bharadwaj, Ms.
Akshita Dogra & Mr. Akhil Shrestha,
Advs. for ICICI Bank.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH



ORDER

%

27.04.2026

1. These are writ petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

W.P.(C) 4819/2026

“1. Call for the show cause notice bearing Ref. No. ICICI/GSMG/FY2025-26/224, dated 06.02.2026, issued by the Respondent and quash the same as being violative of Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution; and

2. Call for the letter bearing Ref. No. ICICI/DSMG/FY2025-26/233, dated 18.03.2026, issued by the Respondent and quash the same as being violative of Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution...”

W.P.(C) 4879/2026

“1. Call for the show cause notice bearing Ref. No. ICICI/GSMG/FY2025-26/224, dated 06.02.2026, issued by the Respondent and quash the same as being violative of Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution; and

2. Call for the letter bearing Ref. No. ICICI/DSMG/FY2025-26/232, dated 18.03.2026, issued by the Respondent and quash the same as being violative of Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution...”

2. The case of the petitioner(s) is that the impugned action of the respondent is not only contrary to the law but highly belated and cannot be maintained. Additionally, even on facts, the proposal to classify the petitioner(s) as wilful defaulters is without merit.



3. Mr. Goel, learned counsel for the respondent, states that the impugned communication dated 18.03.2026 is not a decision of the identification committee but it is only a rejoinder to the replies dated 24.02.2026 of the petitioner(s), in response to the show cause notice dated 06.02.2026. The identification committee is yet to adjudicate the matter on merits and hence, the present petitions are premature at this stage.

4. I have heard learned counsels for the parties.

5. For the said reasons, I am inclined to agree with the submissions of Mr. Goel, learned counsel for the respondent, and the present petitions, at this stage, seem to be premature as the identification committee is yet to form an opinion regarding the classification of the petitioner(s).

6. In view of the aforesaid, the present petitions, at this stage, are disposed of, with liberty to the petitioner(s) to approach this Court in accordance with law, as and when the decision of the identification committee is passed.

7. The petitioner(s) are at liberty to file additional submissions based on the Forensic Audit Report (FAR) given to the petitioner(s) along with the communication dated 18.03.2026 within two weeks from today. The identification committee will consider the said additional submissions given by the petitioner(s).

8. The Court has not examined the merits of the controversy. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

9. The present petitions are disposed of in aforesaid terms, along with pending applications, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

APRIL 27, 2026/NG