

VIPIN KUMAR JAIN (senior citizen) Vs. VIPUL KUMAR JAIN
15.04.2026

File taken up today as 14.04.2026 was declared holiday pursuant to the Notification No.71/ G-4/Genl.-I/DHC dated 10.04.2026.

Present: Sh. Sanjeev Kumar and Ms. Ankita Kashyap, Ld.
Counsels for the plaintiff.

This is a suit for seeking damages of Rs.2 crores on account of defamation filed by plaintiff against the defendants, on the ground that the defendants have defamed the plaintiff by putting notice dated 23.09.2025 on the notice of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar, Delhi, whereby the earlier boycott of three persons including the plaintiff has been cancelled and the decision taken in the GBM dated 22.05.2022 was withdrawn.

I have perused the plaint alongwith documents.

It is the case of the plaintiff that earlier the defendant no.2/ Mr. Sunil Kumar Jain alongwith other members had circulated a letter dated 05.07.2021 amongst the entire Jain Community including the members of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.) thereby disclosing the fact of misuse and misappropriation of funds of the Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar amounting to Rs.7.5 crores by Sh. Vijay Kumar Jain and the defendant no.1; that the plaintiff also supported the defendant no.2 to bring back the pious funds of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar of approximately Rs.7.5 crores, but the previous managing committee of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.) was dissolved in the GBM held on 15.10.2021 and a new managing committee was formed, whereby the defendant no.2 was selected as President, but instead of bringing back the said funds, the defendant no.2 withdrew his

complaint in connivance with Mr. Vijay Kumar Jain and the defendant no.1.

It is also alleged by the plaintiff that the plaintiff kept on raising his voice to bring back the funds of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar misappropriated by Sh. Vijay Kumar Jain and defendant no.1 alongwith the connivance and complicity of the unconstitutional and illegal new managing committee, which also boycotted the plaintiff alongwith two other members of the Society from the Jain Community.

Admittedly, the plaintiff has filed one letter dated 22.05.2022, whereby the committee of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.) had condemned the acts of one Sh. Hem Chand Jain and Sh. Ajay Jain for levelling false allegations and misguiding the society and for misbehaving with the officials who had conducted the elections of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.), and subsequently the said Sh. Hem Chand Jain and the plaintiff were boycotted from the society by the new managing committee of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.) vide notice dated 17.10.2022, **and the said notice or the constitution of the new managing committee of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.) has never been challenged by the plaintiff till date.**

It is pertinent to note that the plaintiff has filed the present suit, whereby the managing committee of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.) vide its impugned notice dated 23.09.2025, have now recalled the said boycott, alleging that by way of the impugned notice, the new managing committee has again defamed the plaintiff.

Even otherwise, the plaintiff has failed to show as to how any defamation has been caused to the plaintiff by way of the impugned notice dated 23.09.2025, as in the said notice, the new managing committee of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.) including the defendants, have been alleged to have now recalled the previous boycott of the plaintiff from the Jain Community, and admittedly, the plaintiff has never challenged the said boycott earlier made by the managing committee of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.) vide notice dated 17.10.2022.

Perusal of the impugned notice dated 23.09.2025 shows that neither the same has been signed by any members of the new managing committee of Shri Digambar Jain Temple, Rishabh Vihar (Reg.), nor the same mentions any reference of the previous boycott notice dated 17.10.2022 or the name of the plaintiff in the impugned notice.

It is also pertinent to note that impugned notice dated 23.09.2025 also does not bear the signatures of the defendants herein.

In view of the above, this Court holds that the plaintiff has failed to prima-facie show, even on demurrer, that any defamation of the plaintiff has been caused by way of the impugned notice dated 23.09.2025 by the defendants, as alleged, and the present plaint stands rejected U/o 7 Rule 11(a) CPC on the grounds of non-disclosure of cause of action in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendants.

File be consigned to record room.

(Ankur Jain-II)
DJ-02, SHD District
KKD/Delhi 15.04.2026