

**Case No. 284 of 2024**

09.05.2025

Present : Shri H.K Shekhar, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Rajiv Vig, Counsel for R-1.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for Respondent, RCS.

1. The Petitioner is again directed to comply with the direction of the Court given on the last date of hearing i.e. on 27.03.2025 to formally implead RCS as a party and to file the amended memo of parties.
2. The Respondent, RCS made appearance and sought time to file reply. Allowed and directed to file their reply including on maintainability.
3. Adj. to 11.07.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 84 & 85 of 2024**

09.05.2025

Present : Shri Apurv Rastogi, Counsel for Petitioner in both cases.

: Shri Mansoor Hussain, AR for R-1, Society along with Shri S.K. Sharma, Counsel for R-2, Society.

: Shri Anis Ahmed, Counsel for R-2, BSNL in case no. 84/2024.

1. The matter to come up for final arguments on the next date of hearing. Till the time of the next hearing, Petitioner is protected by the interim orders of this Court.
2. Adj. to 08.07.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 221 of 2024**

09.05.2025

Present : Shri Sabhya Chaudhary, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-1, RCS  
: Shri Rajiv Vig, Counsel for R-2, Society.

1. Petitioner sought time to file rejoinder to the response of R-2 which is already filed. Allowed.
2. R-1, RCS sought time to file reply before the next date of hearing. Allowed.
3. Adj. to 11.07.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 361 of 2024**

09.05.2025

Present : Shri S. K. Sharma, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Akshit Sachdeva, Counsel for R-1, Bank.

1. Heard the parties.
2. The preliminary objection raised by the R-1, Bank that the petitioner is very well aware of the proceedings. In fact the petitioner is not only aware of the loan agreement; the petitioner has also given surety as executants. The Respondent, Bank also filed documents to support this.
3. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner was not given the same set of documents as placed before this Court and on this issue, the petitioner is directed to inspect the case file so that the matter can be decided.
4. Accordingly, both the parties are directed to file their written submissions within two weeks so that the matter can be decided qua the preliminary objection.
5. Case is reserved for pronouncement of orders on the issue of preliminary objection on 27.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 341 of 2024**

09.05.2025

Present : Shri Sanket Dhawan, Treasurer for Petitioner in both cases.  
: Shri S. K. Sharma alongwith S. K. Sharma, Counsels for R-1 in both cases.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for Respondent, RCS in both cases.

1. Reply of Respondents is already on record.
2. The petitioner sought time to lead the arguments. Allowed as a final opportunity.
3. Interim order to continue till the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. for final arguments to 17.07.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 10 of 2025**

09.05.2025

Present : Shri Sanket Dhawan, Treasurer for Petitioner in both cases.  
: Shri S. K. Sharma alongwith S. K. Sharma, Counsels for R-1 in both cases.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for Respondent, RCS in both cases.

1. Reply of Respondents is already on record.
2. The petitioner sought time to lead the arguments. Allowed as a final opportunity.
3. Interim order to continue till the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. for final arguments to 17.07.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 162 of 2024**

09.05.2025

Present : Shri Ravi Vashishth, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-1, RCS.  
: Shri Prajwal Sharma, Counsel for R-2.

1. Heard the parties.
2. Both the parties are directed to file their written submissions/arguments alongwith citations in support of their averments within two weeks, where after the orders shall be passed based on the documents available on record.
3. Case is reserved for pronouncement of orders on 30.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 246 of 2024**

09.05.2025

Present : Ms.Nishita Gupta, Counsel for Petitioner.  
          : Mr.Faizan Asif, S/o Mohd.Asif, Respondent.

1. The Petitioner sought time to file rejoinder. Allowed.
2. Adj. to 11.07.2025 for rejoinder/final arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**



**Case No. 317 of 2024**

09.05.2025

Present : Ms.Nishita Gupta, Counsel for Petitioner.  
          : Mr.Faizan Asif, S/o Mohd.Asif, Respondent.

1. The Petitioner sought time to file rejoinder. Allowed.
2. Adj. to 11.07.2025 for rejoinder/final arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## **Case No. 34 of 2025 & 35 of 2025**

09.05.2025

Present : Mr. S.K. Maniktala, Counsel for Appellant (in both the cases).

: Mr. Junaid Khan, Proxy Counsel for Respondent, DSIIDC (in both the cases).

1. The Respondent sought time to file the documents alongwith the information as sought by this court on the last date of hearing i.e. 11.04.2025 as well as on 28.03.2025. The Respondent pleaded that it is taking time to collect that information and submitted that no further time will be sought by the Respondent. The prayer of the Respondent is allowed with the condition that such information shall be filed before the next date of hearing in the registry and also a copy of the same shall be provided to the Appellant at least three days in advance before the next date of hearing. In case, the Respondent fails to do so, it will be taken as if the Respondent has nothing to file and the matter shall proceed accordingly.
2. Final adjournment is given for hearing both the sides for 20.05.2025 and both the parties may come prepared with their submissions so that the matter can be finally heard and taken up for decision.
3. The primary issues for the Appellant to explain on the next date of hearing are as to how the Appellant is legally entitled to be heard when the matter has not been decided by the higher courts in favour of the Appellant; as to how the policy provides relief to the Appellant in cases of mis-use or sub-lease and how this forum has jurisdiction in the matter.

4. The Respondent on the other hand has to clarify as to whether the Respondent has policies, which cover cases of mis-use and sub-lease and regularisation as a consequence of violation of lease contract, from the date of first cancellation till the date as already explained elsewhere in the earlier proceedings and also response of the department/organization qua the Appellant's submission that the Appellant is being discriminated as other cases of mis-use and sub-lease have already been regularized by the department.
5. Adj. to 20.05.2025

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 101 of 2025**

**Jain Cooperative Bank Ltd.  
Vs.  
RCS & Anr.**

09.05.2025

Mentioned today by Shri Abhinav Sharma, Ld.Counsel for Petitioner.

1. The matter was mentioned.
2. The Petitioner is aggrieved by the impugned orders dated 17.04.2025 which directs the Petitioner Bank to provide "Information" in terms of the Delhi Cooperative Societies Act & Rules within 10 days of the impugned orders. The Petitioner is aggrieved by the orders being non-specific and devoid of any reason in terms of the contents of the said order. The Petitioner prayed for setting aside the said orders and protect the Bank from such orders in terms of the revisional jurisdiction of this court under Section 116 of the DCS Act, 2003.
3. The impugned orders were perused. The impugned orders do not clarify as to in what capacity the Petitioner is entitled for any information which the said order is alluding to. The impugned orders do not also specify as to what that information is and how such an information under the Delhi Cooperative Societies Act, 2003 & its corresponding Rules is to be provided by the Petitioner Bank herein to the Petitioner as referred in the impugned orders.
4. Any orders issued by judicial and quasi judicial authorities should be self-contained and speaking in terms of the legal frame-work and clearly contain the reasons and logic qua the directions contained in such orders. The impugned orders are found wanting on such an account and hence, prima-facie, cannot be sustained. Accordingly, the said orders shall not be acted upon by the Registrar Cooperative Societies.
5. However, the RCS is at liberty to revisit the matter giving adequate opportunities to both the parties and after

hearing, the RCS will be at liberty to pass speaking orders as per law.

6. The present revision petition bearing case No.101/2025 titled "***Jain Cooperative Bank Ltd. Vs. RCS & Anr.***" is accordingly disposed of in terms of above.
7. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**(CHETAN B. SANGHI)**  
**Financial Commissioner,**  
**Delhi**