



\$~40

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8525/2024 and CM APPL. 34993/2024**

**AJAY PARKASH SHRIVASTAVA**

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Ravi Ranjan, Advocate.**

versus

**GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.** .....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Tushar Sannu, Ms Pulak Gupta Joshi, Ms Payal Rajput, Advocats for GNCTD.**

**Mr. Ravinder Kumar Tanwar, Mr. Ujjwal Kumar, Advocates for R3 to R5.**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

% **10.03.2026**

1. The petition is for the following relief:

*“A. Issue a Writ of Mandamus against the respondent No.1 and 2 thereby directing them to adjudicate the representation of the petitioner made before the respondent No. 2 on 07.02.2022 and decide the correctness of the list members of the Board of Management of the Society in a time bound manner.*

*B. Pass a Writ of mandamus against the respondent No. 2 thereby directing it to restrain the respondent No. 3 to 5 from representing and acting as the office bearers of the Society on the basis of their list of office bearers of the Board of Management submitted in the office of the respondent No. 2 till the disposal of the present Writ Petition in the interest of Justice.”*

2. The respondents by way of their reply have placed on record order dated 26.07.2024 passed by the Registrar of Society, District East, L.M.



Bundh Shastri Nagar Delhi-31. It is the position taken by the Registrar that as per Section 13 of the Societies Registration Act, 1860 as applicable to Govt. Of NCT of Delhi, in the event of any dispute arising among the governing body or the members of the society, the adjustment of its affairs shall be referred to the principal Court of original civil jurisdiction of the district in which the chief building of the society is situated and the Court shall make such order in the matter as it may deem requisite. It is also stated that as per the available record by the Society namely Spiritual Regeneration Movement Foundation, two different lists of office bearers have been submitted in that office. The dispute essentially relates to the office bearers. The petitioner, therefore, will have to take appropriate remedy in accordance with law. The dispute with respect to the affairs of the Society as to be governed by a particular body cannot be adjudicated. Even otherwise, the relief prayed in the instant writ petition was essentially with respect to decision on the petitioner's representation. Since the same has been rendered, the correctness thereof will have to be challenged in accordance with law.

3. With these observations and leaving all issues open, the petition stands disposed of. Pending application also stands disposed of.

**PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**MARCH 10, 2026**

**tr**