



\$~82 to 84

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 3319/2020 & CM APPL. 22634/2026**

ARVIND KADYAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Khemka, Ms. Tanvi Aggarwal and Ms. Pragya Yadav, Advocates.

versus

BACHAN SINGH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Tanmay Cheema and Mr. Sarthak Gupta, Advocates for R-1.
Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. Central Govt. Counsel for R-2.
Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Kushagra Kumar and Mr. Kumar Rana, Advocates for UOI.

+ **W.P.(C) 3320/2020 & CM APPL. 22320/2026**

RAJIV CHOPRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Khemka, Ms. Tanvi Aggarwal and Ms. Pragya Yadav, Advocates.

versus

BACHAN SINGH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Tanmay Cheema and Mr. Sarthak Gupta, Advocates for R-1.
Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. Central Govt. Counsel for R-2.
Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Kushagra Kumar and Mr. Kumar Rana, Advocates for UOI.

+ **W.P.(C) 4811/2020 & CM APPL. 22565/2026**

STATE TRADING CORPORATION OF INDIA LIMITED



.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Tarkeshwar Nath, Mr. Harshit
Singh and Mr. Anand Dev,
Advocates.

versus

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCHEDULE CASTES & ORS.

.....Respondents
Through: Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. Central Govt.
Counsel for R-1.
Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj, CGSC
with Mr. Kushagra Kumar and Mr.
Kumar Rana, Advocates for UOI.
Mr. Tanmay Cheema and Mr. Sarthak
Gupta, Advocates for Bachan Singh.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

% **08.04.2026**

REVIEW PET. 153/2026 in W.P.(C) 3319/2020, REVIEW PET. 150/2026 in W.P.(C) 3320/2020 and REVIEW PET. 151/2026 in W.P.(C) 4811/2020

1. These review petitions have been filed seeking review of the common order dated 09th February, 2026, whereby this Court set aside the order dated 09th March, 2020 passed by the National Commission for Scheduled Castes [*“the Commission”*].
2. Mr. Tanmay Cheema, counsel for the Review Petitioner, submits that while the Review Petitioner does not dispute the finding of this Court that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to direct registration of an FIR, it ought to be clarified that the concerned police authorities are not precluded from taking action, including registration of an FIR, if upon conducting an



inquiry, a cognizable offence is made out.

3. Mr. Cheema further contends that, insofar as the Review Petitioner's grievances pertaining to service matters against the State Trading Corporation of India Limited are concerned, liberty ought to be expressly reserved in favour of the Review Petitioner to avail appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

4. Having considered the submissions, this Court notes that the impugned order neither restrains nor curtails the Review Petitioner's right to pursue remedies available under law. Insofar as criminal law remedies are concerned, if the Review Petitioner is aggrieved by any act that may constitute a cognizable offence, it is always open to him to approach the competent authorities in accordance with law. The exercise of such remedies does not depend upon any recommendation of the Commission.

5. Likewise, with respect to grievances relating to service matters, the Review Petitioner is at liberty to pursue such remedies as may be available before the appropriate forum. The order under review does not foreclose or prejudice such remedies.

6. In view of the above observations, this Court does not find any reason warranting review of the common order dated 09th February, 2026.

7. The review petitions are accordingly dismissed, along with pending application(s), if any.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

APRIL 8, 2026

as