



\$~39

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

+ **W.P.(C) 465/2026**

DHARAMVIR SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: None.

versus

**THE NAV JAGRITI CGHS LTD. THROUGH ITS PRESIDENT /
SECRETARY**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. S.K. Sharma and Mr. J.S. Anand,
Adv. for Society
Ms. Urvi Mohan, Adv. for UOI

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

% **24.02.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CM APPL. 12423/2026 (for exemption)

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

CM APPL. 12422/2026

3. The present application has been filed by the Petitioners under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, seeking recall of order dated 14th January, 2026.
4. *Vide* order dated 14th January, 2026 the Court had directed as under:

“3. In terms of the above, the DCT has directed that the earlier arbitral award dated 9th August, 2023 is liable to be set aside and a fresh Arbitrator be appointed by the Registrar Co-operative Societies (hereinafter 'RCS').



4. Accordingly, this Court is of the opinion that impugned orders do not warrant any interference.

5. The parties shall now appear before the RCS on 11th February, 2026 at 2:00 P.M.

6. The RCS shall appoint an Arbitrator in terms of the impugned order dated 19th August, 2025.

7. Ms. Urvi Mohan Id. Counsel, who present in the Court, is requested to communicate this order to the RCS.

8. A copy of this order shall also be communicated to the Respondent Society by the Registry for necessary information and compliance.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of in these terms. All pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.”

5. The ground raised by the Petitioners in the present application is that the Id. Counsel for the Petitioners could not render effective assistance to the Court on the said date, due to his medical condition. Thus, it is stated that due to absence of effective assistance, the petition was dismissed without the petition being considered on merits.

6. The Court has considered the application filed by the Petitioners. A perusal of the record would show that in terms of the impugned order of the DCT dated 19th August 2025, the intention of the DCT was to ensure that there are no conflicting awards rendered. Hence, the DCT had directed that



the fresh arbitrator be appointed.

7. Accordingly, this Court was of the opinion that the said order of DCT does not warrant interference and had directed that the fresh arbitrator be appointed.

8. At this stage, after seeking instructions, Ms. Urvi Mohan, Id. Counsel submits that the Petitioner has participated in the proceedings before the RCS. It is further submitted that an arbitrator is likely to be appointed within the period of two weeks.

9. None appears for the Petitioner. No further orders are called for in this application. Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

MADHU JAIN, J.

FEBRUARY 24, 2026

ys/dj/sm