



\$~27

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 16133/2024**
MS CHAUDHARI TRADING COMPANY PVT LTDPetitioner

Through: appearance not given.

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND ANR.Respondents
Through: Ms. Tanya Chowdhary, Ms. Manisha
Singh, Mr. Rohan Srivastava, Advs.
for R-1.
Mr. Sumeet Batra, Mr. Rishabh Jain,
Advs. with Ms. Anshita Hooda, Legal
Manager for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
09.04.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

“a. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus thereby directing the Respondent No. 01 to initiate proceedings for cancellation of the license for violation of the guidelines and terms & conditions imposed, by which the Respondent No. 02 Bank has been clearly acting against norms and guidelines issued by Respondent No. 01 time to time.

b. Direct the Respondent No. 01 to take legal action against the officials of the Respondent no. 02 bank, who are



arbitrarily mala fide, and contrary to the RBI guidelines have been charging arbitrary interest, even during the Covid-19 pandemic.”

2. Respondent No. 1 is Reserve Bank of India and respondent No. 2 is Karur Vyas Bank Ltd.
3. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner is engaged in the business of importing and cutting timber. The petitioner is aggrieved by the action of respondent No. 1, wherein respondent No. 1 has dismissed the complaint of the petitioner seeking action against charging of interest by respondent No. 2.
4. It is stated that respondent No. 2 has been charging higher interest on the petitioner and harassing the petitioner by non issuance of ILC/FLC. The respondent No. 2 also threatened that the petitioner will be declared as NPA and the mortgaged property would be sold off. Hence the petitioner under threat and coercion signed new sanction letter approvals which are contrary to RBI guidelines.
5. I am of the view that the order dated 23.09.2022 has rightly observed that the rate of interest charged by the respondent No. 2/bank is as per the sanctioned letter which has been duly signed and accepted by the petitioner. The order further observed that the petitioner has continued to proceed with the business relationship with the bank which is purely its commercial decision.
6. I find no infirmity in the reasoning of respondent no. 1 mentioned in the impugned order. Additionally, if any document has been forcefully executed by the petitioner under coercion, threat or pressure, the remedy available with



the petitioner is to file a suit for injunction/cancellation and a petition invoking extraordinary writ jurisdiction will not lie.

7. Hence, the petition is accordingly dismissed.

JASMEET SINGH, J

APRIL 9, 2026/NG