



\$~24

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

+ W.P.(C) 6899/2021

ANIL GOEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishabh Jain, Adv.
versus

INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY
BOARD OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **15.01.2026**

1. The prayers in the petition is for disclosure of the reasons and documents forming the basis for the closure of the petitioner's complaint by the respondent, along with the procedure adopted for the same.
2. There is no reason to undertake a detailed exercise and to scrutinise the facts at this stage. The respondent is an authority established under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.
3. If a complaint is made by the petitioner to the said authority, it is incumbent upon respondent no.1 to take it to its logical conclusion. The respondent, in exercise of its powers under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Grievance and Complaint Handling Procedure) Regulations, 2017, acts as a quasi-judicial authority. It is settled law that quasi-judicial authorities are bound to assign reasons for their decisions which adversely affect the rights of any party. Reference can be made to, *inter alia*, the



decision of the Supreme Court in *Bhagat Raja v. Union of India*¹. If reasons are not assigned or supplied to the petitioner, he may not be able to take remedy, which he may have against the decision.

4. Under these circumstances, the petition stands disposed of with direction to the respondent to supply a copy of the reasons for closure of the petitioner's complaint.

5. Petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

JANUARY 15, 2026/p/amg

¹ 1967 SCR (3) 302