



\$~41 & 42

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

W.P.(C) 1227/2008, CM APPL. 2373/2008, CM APPL. 9352/2008,
CM APPL. 1742/2012

MADAN LAL & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Ms. S. Janani, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Nishant Kumar, Advocate
versus

INDUSTRIAL FINANCE CORPORATIOIN OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Virendra Pratap Singh Charak,
SPC with Ms. Shubhra Parashar and
Ms. Nasreen Khatoon, Advocates for
UOI
Mr. Dinkar Singh and Mr. Rohit
Singh, Advocates

42

+ W.P.(C) 3588/2008, CM APPL. 6906/2008 & CM APPL. 7859/2008

P.C.UPPADHAYA & ORSPetitioners

Through: Ms. S. Janani, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Nishant Kumar, Advocate
versus

INDUSTRIAL FINANCIAL CORPORATION OF INDIA & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dinkar Singh and Mr. Rohit
Singh, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

% **08.01.2026**

1. The preliminary issue with regard to the maintainability of the Writ was made on 05.03.2024 wherein the objection has been taken up that the



Respondent was not a Government entity and the Writ was not maintainable.

2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners has referred to judgment of the Supreme Court in Mr. R.S. Madireddy and Anr. vs. Union of India & Ors., JT 2024 (6) SC 342 to contest that the status of the Respondent on the date of decision is to be considered for adjudicating on the maintainability of the Writ Petition since as on date, admittedly Respondent is a State entity, the present Writ is maintainable.

3. The said judgment be taken on record.

4. Learned Counsel for the Respondents seeks time to address the arguments on this aspect.

5. Be listed on 25.03.2026.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

JANUARY 8, 2026

N