



\$~46

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14942/2024 & CM APPL. 5704/2025**

GEETA SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ehraz Zafar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Vinay Yadav, CGSC With Ms
Kamna Behrani with Mr Vivek
Nagar, GP.
Mr. Sparsh Prasad and Mr. Vishal
Kapoor, Advocates for R-4&5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

27.04.2026

1. The petition is for directions to respondent no. 2-Registrar of Companies, Delhi (**ROC**), to supply all the relevant certificates on the basis of which the official address of respondent no. 5-company was registered to be No. C-217, East End Apartment, Mayur Vihar Extension Phase-1, New Delhi-110096.
2. As per the petitioner, she is the owner of the aforesaid property, which, as per official records, was used as the registered address of the company since the year 2008, till it was changed in the year 2019 to Shop No.145, Jaipuria Plaza, D-68-A, Sector-26, Noida, Gautam Budh Nagar, Uttar Pradesh. She claims to have become aware of these facts only in the year 2024.



3. The petitioner states that she had sought the aforesaid documents from the ROC *vide* letter dated 20.05.2024, but had not got any response thereto.
4. As per the stand taken by the ROC in the counter affidavit, the entire record of the company is available on the online portal of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs and the same can be accessed on the website upon payment of a nominal fee. Further, it is stated that the new registered address of the company falls within the jurisdiction of the ROC, Uttar Pradesh, and consequently, the entire records stand transferred to the concerned ROC.
5. It is seen that the prayer of the petitioner, i.e., for accessing the relevant documents, can be addressed by applying for the same through the website of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs.
6. Learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner submits that on the website, all the information pertaining to the company is available except the information sought herein.
7. Considering the stand taken by the ROC, the petitioner ought to presume that the official address of the company was registered as aforesaid on the basis only of the documents as are available on the online portal.
8. The petitioner's grievance, in actuality, seems to be that the concerned authority had registered the aforesaid address to be the registered office of the company, without any documentary basis. If that be so, and if there has been any deficiency in discharge of statutory duties on the part of the concerned authorities, she shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.
9. The scope of this petition being only for the petitioner to receive certain documents, this Court cannot expand the same by granting relief not prayed for by the petitioner. Reference can be made to the decision of the



Supreme Court in ***Bharat Amratlal Kothari vs Dosukhan Samadkhan Sindhi & Ors.***,¹ wherein, the Court has held as under:

“14. The approach of the High Court in granting relief not prayed for cannot be approved by this Court. Every petition under Article 226 of the Constitution must contain a relief clause. Whenever the petitioner is entitled or is claiming more than one relief, he must pray for all the reliefs. Under the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, if the plaintiff omits, except with the leave of the court, to sue for any particular relief which he is entitled to get, he will not afterwards be allowed to sue in respect of the portion so omitted or relinquished. Though the provisions of the Code are not made applicable to the proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution, the general principles made in the Civil Procedure Code will apply even to writ petitions. It is, therefore, incumbent on the petitioner to claim all reliefs he seeks from the court. Normally, the court will grant only those reliefs specifically prayed by the petitioner. Though the court has very wide discretion in granting relief, the court, however, cannot, ignoring and keeping aside the norms and principles governing grant of relief, grant a relief not even prayed for by the petitioner.”

10. With that liberty, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 27, 2026/p

¹ AIR 2010 SUPREME COURT 475