



\$~86

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

+ **W.P.(C) 60/2026**

SATYA PRAKASH RAVIDAS

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

THE REGISTRAR OF SOCIETIES & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms Avni Singh(Panel Counsel-
GNCTD) with Mr Vaibhav Sharma,
Advocates.

Mr. Anil Dutt (adv.) for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **28.04.2026**

1. The petitioner seems to be a chronic litigant. He has filed as many as five proceedings i.e. four writ petitions and one contempt petition. They were disposed *vide* judgment dated 02.02.2026. If paragraph 18 of the said judgment is considered in a right perspective, it would indicate that the relief prayed herein is overlapping. The petitioner then carried the order dated 02.02.2026 *qua* W.P.(C) 15987/2025 in LPA and the LPA Court *vide* order dated 09.04.2026 has dismissed the appeal.
2. The petitioner was duty-bound to disclose the earlier proceedings, which were carried out at his instance.
3. The Supreme Court in the case of ***Auroville Foundation v. Natasha Storey***¹, in paragraph no.9 has emphasized the necessity of parties disclosing

¹ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 556



necessary facts and circumstances, which have a material bearing on the proper adjudication of the *lis*. Paragraph 9 of the said decision is extracted as under:

“9. It is no more res integra that the Doctrine of “Clean hands and non-suppression of material facts” is applicable with full force to every proceedings before any judicial forum. The party invoking extraordinary jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India must come with clean hands and disclose all correct and material facts in his Writ Petition. If it is brought to the notice of the Court that the petition has been guilty of suppression of material and relevant facts or has not come with clean hands, such conduct must be seriously viewed by the courts as the abuse of process of law and the petition must be dismissed on that ground alone without entering into the merits of the matter.”

4. The petitioner may have a genuine case, however, nothing precluded from disclosing the adjudication of the earlier writ petition at his instance. That too, when the reliefs are clearly overlapping. Under almost the same circumstances, this Court in W.P.(C) 18571/2025 has also dismissed another petition of this very petitioner *vide* order dated 20.04.2026.

5. Petition deserves to be dismissed on merits as the controversy stands adjudicated in earlier proceedings, as well as, on the ground of suppression of the material facts. The same is accordingly dismissed.

6. The Court was of the opinion that the petitioner should be saddled with cost, however, keeping in mind that the petitioner appears in person, the court refrained from imposing cost.

7. Petition stands dismissed.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 28, 2026/P