

**Case No. 222 of 2025**

22.01.2026

Present : Shri Bharat Bhushan Bhatia, Counsel for Petitioners.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for Respondent, RCS.  
: Shri Rohit, Counsel for R-6, Ms. Neena Kapoor.  
: Shri Jogindra Kumar, Counsel for R-1, Society.  
(FILED VAKALATNAMA)

1. The counsel for Petitioners contended that a complaint was filed by the Petitioners herein against ex-Managing Committee of R-1, Society. The office of RCS appointed an Inspecting Officer u/s 61 of DCS Act 2003 to conduct inquiry into the complaint. The inspection report was submitted by the inspecting officer on 13.01.2020. On the basis of the findings of the inspection report, the RCS ordered for inquiry u/s 62 of DCS Act and inquiry officer was appointed on 29.05.2020 and the inquiry officer submitted his report on 02.09.2021. After examination of inspection as well as inquiry reports, the office of RCS directed inquiry u/s 66 of DCS Act vide order dated 14.10.2024 and inquiry officer was appointed. The inquiry officer submitted his report on 17.06.2025 and a copy of which was duly forwarded to the Petitioners herein vide communication dated 06.08.2025 by the Assistant Registrar, Section IV (GH Branch).
2. The Petitioners have approached this Court against the manner in which the inquiry u/s 66 has been conducted by the inquiry officer. The Inquiry officer ignored the submissions made by the Petitioners. No personal appearance was sought and no clarifications were sought from the persons against whom the complaint was made. The inquiry officer ignored that the ex-management has failed to handover the books of accounts for scrutiny. The above discrepancies pointed out that the inquiry was conducted by the inquiry officer in violation of Act and Rules and by not following due process of law.

3. Counsel for Petitioners is directed to clarify the issue of limitation in the present case on the next date of hearing. He will also clarify what his real grievance is and what kind of relief he is seeking at this stage.
4. It is noted that Petitioners have not impleaded the RCS as a party in the present case. Seeing the facts of the case, this Court is of considered view that the RCS is a necessary party in the matter and is therefore impleaded as Respondent. Petitioner undertook to file amended memo of parties accordingly before the next date of hearing. Petitioner is directed to supply copy of petition to the RCS to enable the RCS to file reply.
5. Counsel for R-1/Society submitted that current Managing Committee is elected in 2023 and the complaint period is of 2017-2019. Counsel stated that the Petitioners have unfairly included only some of ex-members of MC of the Society, and left out the rest. Further, R-1 sought time to file reply which is allowed. Remaining Respondents are directed to file reply before the next date of hearing.
6. Adj. to 30.01.2026 for further arguments.

  
**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

22.01.2026

Present : Shri Sandeep Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel along with Shri Gaurav Dahia, Sr. Assistant, Shri Yashwant Dagar, ASO for Respondent, RCS.

1. The Counsel for Petitioner Society contended that the present revision petition has been filed challenging the order dated 30.10.2025 passed by the Assistant Registrar. Counsel stated that two NDMC employees, Suruchi Chauhan and Amit Kumar Chonkar, applied for membership in March 2025, despite not being permanent NDMC employees on the date of application. The probation of the 2 employees was to end on 03.05.2025 and as per the Society's bye-laws and application terms, only persons with two years of regular service are eligible for membership. They filed complaints before the RCS, which were forwarded to the Society on 17.09.2025. Counsel further submitted that a detailed reply was filed on 29.10.2025 by the Secretary of the Petitioner Society before Assistant Registrar (Banking), which was not considered. Despite this, the Assistant Registrar passed the impugned order granting membership. The order was antedated as 30.10.2025 but dispatched only on 28.11.2025, raising serious doubts about the legality and bona fides of the order.
2. The Counsel for Petitioner also contended that the jurisdiction under Rule 25(2) & (3) of DCS Rules, 2007, only lies with the RCS to entertain appeals against refusal of membership. The Assistant Registrar exceeded his authority by directing grant of membership.
3. On query by this Court to RCS regarding the authority of the Assistant Registrar to grant membership, the

Counsel for Respondent, RCS undertook to file reply on this issue as well as detailed reply to the petition before the next date of hearing. The Petitioner would also clarify what is real issue with the impugned order since the Assistant RCS has only directed membership to be granted only if applicants are found eligible and if in accordance with DCS Act, 2003 and DCS Rules 2007.

4. Adj. to 13.02.2026 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**



22.01.2026

Present : Shri G. L. Verma, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for Respondents, RCS.  
: Shri Mehul Jain, Counsel for Applicants.

1. Counsel for Petitioner contended that on the basis of the complaint of 31 members of the Society, out of 133 total strength, vide letter dated 03.12.2025 requested for removal of the existing Management Committee and for conducting fresh elections as the 5 members of MC have resigned from their respective posts out of existing 8 members, the office of RCS passed the impugned order dated 26.12.2025. The factual position in the matter is that there are 13 members in the Management Committee, 11 members were duly elected and out of them 03 members of the MC resigned and the Society duly informed the office of RCS vide letter dated 08.10.2025. The Society co-opted 03 members in the MC which was also informed by President of the Society to the RCS vide letter dated 30.11.2025. However, the office of RCS in violation of principles of natural justice without affording any opportunity to the present MC of the Society to present their side and without verifying the authenticity of 31 complainants has passed the impugned order appointing an Administrator-cum-Returning Officer under Section 35 (5) of DCS Act, 2003, declaring election agenda dated 06.12.2025 issued by Returning Officer and co-option of members by President as null and void.
2. Counsel for respondents, RCS sought time to file reply before the next date of hearing.
3. Counsel for Applicants filed an application under Order 1 Rule 10 of CPC read with Section 151 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for impleading S/Sh. R. Chandrasekar, Prem Pal Sharma, Pankaj Bisht, S. S. Chauhan and Lalit Kr. Gandhi. As all the applicants are members of the Society and are affected by the present dispute. There

was no objection on this from the other parties. The impleadment application of all five applicants is allowed and the petitioner is directed to file amended memo of parties.

4. Counsel for Petitioner requested for stay of the impugned order on the ground that salaries of employees of the Society could not be released and day-to-day affairs of the Society are hampered. **No Stay** is granted at this stage. However, in the interest of the employees of the Society and for overall Society management, if account of the Society is frozen and the Administrator has taken over charge of the Society, he is directed to release the salary of the employees without any delay. In case, the bank account of the Society has not been frozen by the Administrator, the MC of Society may release the salary of the employees, but would not be permitted to incur any other expenditure.
5. Adj. to 30.01.2026 for arguments.

  
**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 136 of 2025**

22.01.2026

Present : Shri S. K. Sharma, Counsel alongwith Shri K. C. Gandhi P-1 in person.  
: Shri Sanjay Kumar Jha, Supervisor for R-1, Society.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel alongwith Shri Bhavesh Kumar, ASO for R-2, RCS.

1. Counsel for Petitioners filed Minutes of the AGBM dated 19.08.2018 which is taken on record and copy of the same is also supplied to the Respondents.
2. Counsel for Petitioners contended that the petitioners challenged the Inquiry Report dated 21.11.2024 under Section 62 of the DCS Act, 2003, issued by Inquiry Officer Sh. G.P. Singh, appointed by R-2, RCS. This report erroneously granted a clean chit to the Managing Committee (MC) of R-1 Society for the 2016-18 term, despite grave violations of the Act and Rules by the then MC.
3. Counsel for Petitioners further contended that the MC spent Rs. 3,10,274 (audited at Rs. 3,58,774 in 2018-19) on Welcome Room Refurbishment without prior General Body Meeting (GBM) approval of the budget for the same, breaching mandatory provisions under Sections 31(1)(a), 93(1), and 94(1) of the Act. A joint complaint by petitioners and 21 members highlighted this unauthorised expenditure, lacking vouchers, invoices/bills, or receipts, as flagged in the statutory audit report. The report suffers from non-application of mind, absence of reasons and arbitrary disregard of evidence, including MC's own records showing post-facto attempts at sanction. Such unauthorised spending causes financial loss through misappropriation, undermines GBM supremacy, and permits anarchy, if upheld. The petitioners prayed for

quashing of the report and start recovery from the then MC members.

4. Representative for R-1, Society appeared and stated that he can't find the GBM resolution in Society's record that concurred with the budget for the Welcome Room refurbishment and has nothing to counter the arguments made by the Counsel for Petitioners.
5. Counsel for R-2, RCS submitted that the Audit has been done and no negative remarks given in the Inquiry Report dated 21.11.2024 about the money actually spent on refurbishment. Counsel for R-2 further referred para II at Page no. 6 of copy of the Minutes of GBM held on 19.08.2018 which alleged that the General Body in its meeting in 2016 had indeed approved the renovation of the Welcome Room by passing the resolution.
6. In view of the above arguments, Petitioner(s) is directed to explain on the next date of hearing as to whether there is any evidentiary proof in context of the other works taken wherein the GBM was habituated to lay down specific budget for each item of expenditure. R-1, Society is given a final opportunity to file documents posed by this Court on the last date of hearing i.e. 09.01.2026. He may also bring in official who have well-versed with the details of process and procedure of the Society on the next date of hearing.
7. Adj. to 30.01.2026 for final arguments.

  
**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**



22.01.2026

Present : Shri Alok Jain, Petitioner in person.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel alongwith Shri Jitender, Sr. Asstt. for R-1, RCS.  
: Shri Ram Kumar Savant, Administrator for R-2, Society.  
: Shri Mukund Aggarwal, Proxy Counsel for R-3.  
: Shri Soran Singh, In-charge alongwith Shri Mukesh Chand, Section Officer, Member and Shri Vishesh, Sr. Asstt. for Fact-finding Committee.

1. Petitioner appeared in person and made a request to update his address (his earlier address is on record). Petitioner further requested to adjourn the matter after 30.01.2026 due to Rasam Pagdi (Tehrawi) of his Brother-in-law. The request is allowed but no further deferrals would be requested.
2. The appointed Fact-finding Committee filed the report in sealed envelope which is taken on record. Counsel for R-1, RCS is directed to furnish a copy of the report of Fact-finding Committee to the Petitioner and R-3.
3. Representative for R-2 filed written submissions/ reply which is taken on record and copy of the same is supplied to the Parties.
4. Proxy Counsel for R-3 filed reply which is taken on record and requested for adjournment as the main counsel is out of station. Request is allowed.
5. Both the parties are directed to come prepared for arguments on the report of Fact-finding Committee on the next date of hearing. The members of the Fact-finding Committee who are present today, namely, Mr. Soran Singh, In-charge, Mr. Mukesh Chand, Section Officer (Member) and Mr. Vishesh, Sr. Asstt. to remain present on the next date of hearing and bring out the complete facts as per his report. Petitioner and R-3 should also file their point-wise rebuttal on each issue highlighted in the Fact-finding report.
6. Adj. to 05.02.2026 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## **Case No. 198 of 2025**

22.01.2026

Present : Shri Sandeep Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner.  
          : Ms.Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-1, RCS.  
          : Shri Rajiv Parashar, Impleadment Applicant under Rule 1/10.

1. This Court raised a query to the Registrar of Cooperative Societies on the following aspects: (i) whether the impugned order can be considered a speaking order and (ii) whether any notice was served upon the Petitioner prior to the passing of the impugned order.
2. The Counsel for the Petitioner contended that the aforesaid Show Cause Notices were issued to the members of the previous Management Committee, whereas the present Management Committee of the society came into existence on 16.04.2023, and yet the impugned order dated 15.09.2025 was passed against the present society.
3. In rebuttal, Counsel for R-1/RCS submitted that four Show Cause Notices dated 05.09.2022, 16.09.2022, 10.10.2022 and 04.01.2023 were issued to the erstwhile members of the Management Committee, and thereafter the impugned order came to be passed on 15.09.2025. In support of her submissions, Counsel for the RCS placed reliance upon proviso to Section 61 (1) of the Delhi Cooperative Societies Act, 2003, which pertains to inspection of cooperative societies.
4. This Court queried the R-1, RCS that the proviso to Section 61 (1) indeed specifically provides for issuance of a Show Cause Notice and recording the reason before ordering inspection. The Management Committee of the said society had been appointed on 16.04.2023, and order being passed almost 2.5 years later, a notice could have been issued to current M.C.

5. The R-1, RCS is directed to come prepared on the next date of hearing to address the specific points raised by this Court today.
6. Adj. to 13.02.2026 for further arguments



**Financial Commissioner,  
Delhi**

**Case No. 283 of 2024**

22.01.2026

Present : Shri S.D.Sharma, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Ms.Vasu Singh, Counsel alongwith Shri Samir Shandilya, Sr.Assistant for R-1, RCS.  
: Ms.Aeshna Salwan, Proxy Counsel for R-2 to R-4.

1. Due to administrative exigency, the case is adjourned to 12.02.2026 for arguments.



**Financial Commissioner,  
Delhi**



**Case No. 23 of 2025**

22.01.2026

Present : Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel alongwith Mr. Nafees Ahmad, ASO for R-1, RCS.  
: Mr. G.L. Verma, Counsel for R-2.

1. Due to administrative exigency, the case is adjourned to 13.02.2026 for arguments.



**Financial Commissioner,  
Delhi**

**Case No. 166 of 2025**

22.01.2026

Present : Shri Ravindra Kanth, Associate Counsel for  
Petitioner.  
: Shri Ramesh Chand, R-1 in person.  
: Ms.Vasu Singh, Counsel alongwith Shri Sameer  
Shandilya, Sr.Assistant for R-2, RCS.

1. Due to administrative exigency, the case is adjourned to  
13.02.2026 for arguments.

  
**Financial Commissioner,  
Delhi**