



\$~88

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ W.P.(C) 8457/2024 & CM APPL. 34878/2024, CM APPL.  
34879/2024, CM APPL. 34880/2024

THAKAR DASS BHATIA (THROUGH SON CHETAN BHATIA)  
..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Varun Singh, Mr. Rohan  
Chandra, Ms. Alankriti Dwivedi,  
Advocates (M:9811999703)

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA & ANR. .... Respondents  
Through: None.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA**

**ORDER**  
**31.05.2024**

%

**CM APPL. 34879/2024 (For Exemption)**

1. Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. Application is disposed of.

**CM APPL. 34880/2024**

3. The present application has been filed seeking permission to file lengthy list of dates.
4. For the reasons stated in the application, the present application is allowed and the same is accordingly disposed of.

**W.P.(C) 8457/2024 & CM APPL. 34878/2024**

5. The present petition has been filed *inter-alia* with the following prayers:



*“a. issue an appropriate writ in the nature of Certiorari or any other order/s or direction/s quashing the Impugned Order dated 24.01.2024 passed by Respondent No. 1/RBI;*

*b. issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus, thereby directing Respondent No. 1 to resolve Petitioner’s complaint dated 16.11.2023 by passing an award for specific performance under Clause 15(3) of The RBI Integrated Ombudsman Scheme, 2021, thereby directing Respondent No. 2 to release Petitioner’s property from mortgage against loan availed by the Partnership Firm;*

*xxx xxx xxx”*

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no hearing has been granted to the petitioner at the time of passing of the impugned order dated 24<sup>th</sup> January, 2024. He further submits that the said impugned order is a non-speaking order.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment dated 12<sup>th</sup> October, 2023 passed in *W.P.(C) 12682/2023*, wherein, it has been held as follows:

*“xxx xxx xxx*

*35. In light of the foregoing discussion, this court is of the considered opinion that a quasi-judicial body, such as Ombudsman, is reasonably expected to pass a well-reasoned order and any empty formality thereto, deserves to be weeded out. The adherence to the principles of natural justice is the cornerstone of a just and fair legal system as it also proves to be a quintessential safeguard against any adjudicatory arbitrariness in judicial or administrative proceedings. Therefore, undeniably, the Ombudsman is duty bound to pass a reasoned order which would eventually foster a greater transparency in the decision-making process and also inspire the confidence of the common man in efficient dispute resolution through such bodies.*

*xxx xxx xxx”*

8. Learned counsel further submits that since no hearing has been granted to the petitioner, the present petition maybe treated as a representation so that an appropriate decision can be taken by the



respondents.

9. Issue notice to the respondents. Let reply be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of two weeks, thereafter.

10. Re-notify on 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2024.

**MAY 31, 2024**  
au

**MINI PUSHKARNA, J**