



2026:AHC:103354

Reserved on 28.04.2026
Delivered on 06.05.2026

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 10721 of 2026

Committee Of Management BabaPetitioner(s)
Raghunandan Das Vidyalay Vaishnav
Nagar And Another

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 OthersRespondents(s)

Counsel for Petitioners(s) : Yogesh Kumar Saxena
Counsel for Respondent(s) : Alok Dwivedi, C.S.C.

Along with :

Writ - C No. 13322 of 2026:

1. Committee of Management and Another
Versus
State of U.P. and 3 others

Court No. - 32

HON'BLE SAURABH SHYAM SHAMSHERY, J.

1. This is a bunch of two writ petitions whereby same order is under challenge, i.e., an order dated 23.01.2026 passed by Deputy Registrar, Firms, Societies and Chits, Kanpur Region, Kanpur.

2. First writ petition, being Writ-C No. 10721 of 2026 was filed on 12.03.2026 by Committee of Management, Baba Raghunandan Das Vidyalay Vaishnav Nagar, Billhor, Kanpur Nagar through its President, Dr. Rajendra Katiyar and it is supported by an affidavit sworn by one, Gyanendra Awasthi declaring himself to be a pairokar without any further declaration that under what capacity he is connected with petitioners' Committee of Management. The writ petition is accompanied by a resolution dated 08.02.2026 whereby the said deponent was authorized to do pairavi. There is an earlier resolution dated 02.09.2025 whereby Dr. Rajendra Katiyar was authorized to file writ petition instead of Sri Ashok Kumar Katiyar, the Manager of Committee of Management.

3. Second writ petition, being Writ-C No. 13322 of 2026 was filed on 28.03.2026, i.e., subsequent to above referred writ petition by same Committee of Management but now through its Manager, Ashok Kumar Katiyar. This writ petition is accompanied by an affidavit of said petitioner. In this writ petition there is no reference, whether petitioner was authorized to file this writ petition even after earlier writ petition was filed challenging same impugned order through its President.

4. The aforesaid circumstances are explicit example that it was necessary that a conscious decision be taken by Committee of Management not only to challenge any adverse order but to authorize a person, i.e., Office Bearer or Member of Committee of Management as per bye laws. In no circumstance a stranger can be appointed to sworn an affidavit on behalf of Committee of Management and its Office Bearers since in no circumstance it can be assumed that he would be aware with affairs of Committee of Management.

5. In aforesaid circumstances, both writ petitions can be dismissed with cost though at this stage the Court is dismissing only first petition, i.e., Writ-C No. 10721 of 2026 filed by Committee of Management through its President since it is accompanied by an affidavit of a stranger though the Court takes note that there was an authorization but said

authorization cannot be treated to be a proper authorization being contrary to its bye-laws whereby Manager is authorized to represent Committee of Management in legal cases. A cost of Rs. 50,000/- each is imposed on the President of Committee of Management and deponent of referred writ petition.

6. Now only the second writ petition, i.e., Writ-C No. 13322 of 2026 survives wherein petitioners are represented by Sri Prabhakar Awasthi, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Sri A.N. Pandey and Sri Y.K. Saxena, Advocates, Respondents-1 and 2 are represented by learned Standing Counsel and Respondents-3 and 4 are represented by Sri V.K. Singh, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Sri Alok Dwivedi, Advocate.

7. This is a case arising out of a dispute of list of Members of General Body of petitioners' Committee of Management. Earlier a dispute of list of Members was considered by this Court in Writ-C No. 36738 of 2025, wherein an order dated 04.09.2025 was challenged whereby the Deputy Registrar, Kanpur has passed an order that a list dated 30.07.2023 submitted by Ashok Kumar Katiyar (Petitioner herein) being last election of Committee of Management on basis of list of 69 Members of General Body was found to be defective and accordingly election for year 2025-26 which was earlier registered on 30.07.2025 submitted by Sri Ashok Kumar Katiyar, Manager was also cancelled on a complaint of private respondents.

8. Aforesaid Writ-C No. 36738 of 2025 was finally disposed of vide an order dated 20.11.2025 and this Court has directed Deputy Registrar, Kanpur to pass a fresh order after hearing parties and decide the dispute of list of Members. Accordingly a fresh order dated 23.01.2026 was passed whereby a list submitted by Sri Ashok Kumar Katiyar (petitioner herein) of the years 2020-21 and 2025-26 were again found defective and list of Members of General Body for the year 2025-26 submitted by petitioners was not approved and list dated 20.06.2017 submitted by earlier Manager, Sri Shiv Nath Katiyar was declared to be valid. Said order is impugned herein and it's relevant part is mentioned hereinafter:

"मेरे द्वारा उभयपक्षों को सुना गया तथा पत्रावली में उपलब्ध अभिलेखों सहित प्रस्तुत साक्ष्यों का भलीभांति परिशीलन किया गया।

संस्था के तत्कालीन प्रबन्धक श्री शिवनाथ कटियार द्वारा प्रस्तुत शुल्क व प्रपत्रों के आधार पर संस्था का नवीनीकरण दिनांक 23.09.2017 को किया गया था। तत्कालीन प्रबन्धक श्री शिवनाथ कटियार द्वारा संस्था के नवीनीकरण हेतु प्रस्तुत अपने प्रत्यावेदन दिनांक 20.06.2017 के माध्यम से संस्था की 59 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2016-17 प्रस्तुत की गयी थी। जिसमें कुल 56 सदस्यों को जीवित होने का उल्लेख किया गया था। उभयपक्षों के मध्य उपरोक्त सदस्यता सूची को लेकर विवाद नहीं है। श्री शिवनाथ कटियार द्वारा संस्था के नवीनीकरण हेतु पुनः अपना प्रत्यावेदन दिनांक 19.08.2020 प्रस्तुत किया गया था। जिसके क्रम में संस्था का नवीनीकरण प्रमाण पत्र दिनांक 03.09.2020 निर्गत किया गया था। जोकि दिनांक 31.07.2020 से 05 वर्षों के लिये विधि मान्य रहा।

श्री अशोक कुमार कटियार द्वारा अपने पत्र दिनांक 27.06.2025 के माध्यम से संस्था की प्रबन्ध समिति व साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2025-26 पंजीकृत किये जाने के अनुरोध के साथ प्रस्तुत की गयी। जिसे कार्यालय द्वारा दिनांक 30.06.2025 के आदेश के माध्यम से इस शर्त के साथ पंजीकृत किया गया कि प्रस्तुत प्रपत्रों में कोई तथ्य छिपाने या गलत तथ्य प्रस्तुत किये जाने की बात भविष्य में यदि प्रकाश में आती है तो इसका पूर्ण उत्तरदायित्व आपका होगा तथा पंजीकृत अभिलेख पंजीकरण की तिथि से अमान्य एवं विधि शून्य होंगे।

उभयपक्षों के मध्य विवाद की स्थिति 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2020-21 व पंजीकृत की गयी साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2025-26 को लेकर है। श्री अशोक कुमार कटियार डा० राजेन्द्र कटियार का दावा है कि उपरोक्त 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची को आपके कार्यालय में तत्कालीन प्रबन्धक श्री शिवनाथ कटियार द्वारा अपने आवेदन पत्र दिनांक 19.08.2020 के माध्यम से प्रस्तुत किया गया था। जबकि शिकायतकर्तागण श्री योगेन्द्र सिंह कटियार की शिकायतें यह है कि उपरोक्त 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची को तत्कालीन प्रबन्धक श्री शिवनाथ कटियार द्वारा अपने आवेदन पत्र दिनांक 19.08.2020 के माध्यम से प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है तथा यह कथन किया गया है कथित 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2020-21 व 51 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2025-26 में श्री अशोक कुमार कटियार द्वारा फाड़ करके 21 नये सदस्यों के नाम बिना किसी प्रक्रिया को अपनाये हुए जोड़ दिया गया है तथा 19 आजीवन संरक्षक सदस्यों को हटा दिया गया है जोकि पूर्णतया: अवैधानिक है। उनके द्वारा यह अनुरोध

किया गया है कि वर्ष 2020-21 एवं 2025-26 की साधारण सभा में 21 नये अवैध सदस्यों के नाम हटाते हुए 19 पुराने व वैध आजीवन सदस्यों के नाम जोड़ते हुए साधारण सभा घोषित की जाये। अपने कथनों के समर्थन में श्री योगेन्द्र सिंह कटियार द्वारा मो० सईद अहमद इलियास, श्री जावेद कमर रिजवी, श्री शादाब हुसैन, श्री योगेन्द्र कुमार कटियार के नोटरी शपथपत्र प्रस्तुत किये गये जिसमें उनके द्वारा यह कथन किया गया है कि बिना सूचना एवं एजेण्डा कराये तथा उनको बिना सूचित किये उन्हें सदस्यता से हटा दिया गया है। उनकी सदस्यता को बहाल किया जाये। श्री दया शंकर मिश्र का नोटरी शपथपत्र दिनांक 20.08.2025 भी प्रस्तुत किया गया जिसमें उनके द्वारा स्वयं को जीवित होने की घोषणा की गयी है।

कार्यालय आदेश दिनांक 30.06.2025 के माध्यम से श्री अशोक कुमार कटियार द्वारा संस्था के प्रबन्धक की हैसियत से प्रस्तुत 51 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2025-26 को पंजीकृत किया गया था। जिसमें यह दावा किया गया था कि वर्ष 2020-21 की 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची में से मृतकों को अलग करते हुए तथा मात्र 02 नये सदस्य जोड़े गये हैं। यहाँ पर यह उल्लेखनीय है कि उपरोक्त 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची को लेकर तत्समय कोई शिकायत प्राप्त नहीं थी। कार्यालय में वर्ष 2020-21 की साधारण सभा की सूची को लेकर संस्था के वैध सदस्यों द्वारा अपनी आपत्तियाँ प्रस्तुत की गयीं। जिनमे से कतिपय सदस्यों द्वारा जिन्हें वर्ष 2020-21 की साधारण सभा की सूची में नहीं दर्शाया गया है, द्वारा अपने नोटरी शपथपत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए स्वयं को सदस्यता से हटाये जाने को गलत बताया गया है तथा यह कथन किया गया है कि इस सम्बन्ध में कोई भी एजेण्डा जारी नहीं किया गया है व कोई भी मीटिंग नहीं हुई है। उनके द्वारा अपनी सदस्यता को बहाल किये जाने का अनुरोध किया गया है। प्राप्त शिकायतों के क्रम में उभयपक्षों को सुनकर शिकायतों का निस्तारण कार्यालय आदेश दिनांक 04.09.2025 के माध्यम से निस्तारण किया गया था। जिसके विरुद्ध मा० उच्च न्यायालय इलाहाबाद में रिट याचिका संख्या 36738/2025 योजित की गयी थी। जिसपर मा० उच्च न्यायालय द्वारा पारित अपने आदेश दिनांक 20.11.2025 के माध्यम से कार्यालय आदेश दिनांक 04.09.2025 को अपास्त करते हुए प्रकरण को निस्तारित किये जाने के निर्देश दिये गये हैं।

यह भी उल्लेखनीय है कि साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2015-16 जिसे तत्कालीन प्रबन्धक श्री शिवनाथ कटियार द्वारा संस्था के नवीनीकरण के समय कार्यालय में प्रस्तुत किया गया था को लेकर उभयपक्षों के मध्य कोई भी विवाद नहीं है। उभयपक्षों के मध्य 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2020-21 जोकि तत्कालीन प्रबन्धक श्री शिवनाथ कटियार द्वारा हस्ताक्षरित

है, को लेकर है तथा इसी क्रम में पंजीकृत की गयी साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2025-26 के सम्बन्ध में भी शिकायते प्राप्त हैं। कार्यालय द्वारा वर्ष 2020-21 की साधारण सभा की सूची को सोसा०रजि०अधि० 1860 की धारा 4 बी के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत नहीं किया गया है। शिकायतकर्तारों द्वारा दावा किया गया कि निर्विवाद साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2015-16 के 19 आजीवन संरक्षक सदस्यों को वर्ष 2020-21 एवं 2025-26 की साधारण सभा से बिना किसी प्रक्रिया को अपनाये हटा दिया गया है तथा बिना किसी प्रक्रिया को अपनाये 21 नये अवैध सदस्यों को जोड़ दिया गया है। शिकायतकर्तारों की उपरोक्त शिकायतों का विनिश्चय अधोहस्ताक्षरी द्वारा रिट याचिका संख्या 36738/2025 में मा० उच्च न्यायालय द्वारा पारित आदेश दिनांक 20.11.2025 के अनुपालन में किया जाना अपेक्षित है।

सोसा०रजि०अधि० 1860 की धारा- 4 बी के प्रावधान निम्नवत है-

4-B. (1) At the time of registration/renewal of a society, list of members of General Body of that society shall be filed with the Registrar mentioning the name, father's name, address and occupation of the members. The Registrar shall examine the correctness of the list of members of the General Body of such society on the basis of the register of members of the General Body and minutes book thereof, cash book, receipt book of membership fee and bank pass book of the society.

(2) If there is any change in the list of members of the General Body of the society referred to in sub-section (1), on account of induction, removal, registration or death of any member, a modified list of members of General Body, shall be filed with the Registrar, within one month from the date of change.

(3) The list of members of the General Body to be filed with the Registrar under this section shall be signed by two office bearers and two executive members of the society.

Amendment of section 4-B:-

For sub-section (2) of section 4-B of the principal Act, the following sub-section shall be substituted, namely:-

(2) If there is any change in the list of members of the General Body of the society referred to in sub-section (1), on account of

induction, removal, registration or death of any member, a modified list of members of General Body. shall be filed with the Registrar, within one month from the date of change.

Any change in the list of General Body shall not be valid unless it is approved by the Managing Body.

श्री अशोक कुमार कटियार व श्री राजेन्द्र कटियार द्वारा वर्ष 2020-21 की 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची को वैध बताया जा रहा है। जबकि प्राप्त शिकायतों से यह विदित है कि संस्था की निर्विवाद साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2015-16 में दर्शित व जीवित कई सदस्यों को हटाते हुए तथा कुछ नये सदस्यों को जोड़कर साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2020-21 गठित दर्शायी गयी है। इस प्रकार से किये गये परिवर्तनों के सम्बन्ध में सोसा०रजि०अधि० 1860 की धारा 4 बी में दर्शित संस्था के मूल अभिलेखों का परीक्षण की गयी शिकायतों के आलोक में किया जाना आवश्यक हो जाता है तथा इस बात की भी पुष्टि संस्था के मूल अभिलेखों से किया जाना आवश्यक होता है कि परिवर्तनों को लेकर नियमानुसार अनुमोदन संस्था की प्रबन्ध समिति से किया गया है अथवा नहीं। याचीगण सोसा०रजि०अधि० 1860 की धारा 4 बी के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत वर्ष 2020-21 की साधारण सभा में किये गये परिवर्तनों की शुद्धता की जांच हेतु वांछित संस्था के मूल अभिलेख धारा 4 बी (1) में किया गया है, को प्रस्तुत नहीं कर सके हैं। जबकि साधारण सभा सम्बन्धी स्वयं के दावों की वैधता को प्रमाणित करने का दायित्व याचीगणों में ही निहित है। वर्णित स्थिति में साधारण सभा की 69 सदस्यीय साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2020-21 की शुद्धता याचीगण प्रमाणित नहीं कर सके हैं तथा इसी क्रम में कार्यालय द्वारा पंजीकृत साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2025-26 की शुद्धता भी प्रमाणित नहीं होती है।

उपरोक्त तथ्यों एवं उनकी विवेचना के आधार पर याचीगणों / डा० राजेन्द्र कटियार, श्री अशोक कुमार कटियार के साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2020-21 व 2025-26 को लेकर किये गये दावे बलहीन होने के कारण अमान्य किये जाते हैं तथा कार्यालय द्वारा पंजीकृत साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2025-26 को एतद्वारा निरस्त किया जाता है। परिणामस्वरूप उनकी निर्वाचन कार्यवाही दिनांक 30.07.2023 भी अमान्य है तथा तत्क्रम में पंजीकृत प्रबन्ध समिति की सूची वर्ष 2025-26 को भी अमान्य घोषित किया जाता है।

कार्यालय पत्रावली पर उपलब्ध प्रपत्रों एवं शिकायतकर्ता एवं याचीगणों के द्वारा प्रस्तुत प्रपत्रों के आधार पर प्रथम दृष्ट्या कार्यालय पत्रावली पर उपलब्ध साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2020-21 की पुष्टि किसी भी अभिलेखों

के द्वारा नहीं हो सकी है। ऐसी स्थिति में परिस्थितिजन्य साक्ष्यों एवं उभयपक्षों के मध्य विवादहीन साधारण सभा की सूची वर्ष 2016-17 जो कार्यालय पत्रावली के पृष्ठ संख्या-92 व 93 पर उपलब्ध है, जिसे पूर्व प्रबन्धक श्री शिवनाथ कटियार द्वारा कार्यालय में दिनांक 20.06.2017 को प्रस्तुत किया गया है, को अनन्तिम रूप से मान्य घोषित किया जाता है।

तनुसार रिट याचिका संख्या 36738/2025 में मा० उच्च न्यायालय द्वारा पारित आदेश दिनांक 20.11.2025 के अनुपालन में प्रकरण को निस्तारित किया जाता है।" *(Emphasis supplied)*

9. Learned Senior Advocate appearing for petitioners submitted that Deputy Registrar has no power to review its earlier order and by reviewing it, he has committed a legal error. Deputy Registrar by means of impugned order has not only cancelled the list of Members of General Body of the year 2025-26 but also cancelled the election conducted on 30.07.2023 and disapproved the list of Members of Committee of Management for the year 2025-26. Said directions were not only contrary to material on record but beyond the jurisdiction also since there is no provision to cancel entire list of Members of General Body.

10. Learned Senior Advocate by referring Section 4-B of Societies Registration Act, 1860 submitted that Registrar can examine the correctness of list of General Body of a Society on basis of register of Members of said Body and minutes book thereof, cash book, receipt book of membership fee and bank pass book of Society, however, in impugned order there is no such consideration.

11. Per contra, learned Senior Advocate appearing for Respondents-3 and 4 has supported the impugned order that it was passed strictly in compliance of provisions of Section 4-B of Societies Registration Act. It was incumbent upon petitioners to submit documents, such as, resolution that how the list of 59 Members of General Body of 2016-17, was increased to 69 in the year 2021 and subsequently why name of 10 Members were deleted and 11 new Members were added. However, no document was placed on record before concerned respondents, therefore, there is no illegality in impugned order.

12. I have considered the aforesaid submissions and perused the record.

13. On basis of above referred facts, there is no dispute to the list of Members of General Body of petitioners-Committee of Management of the year 2015-16 of 59 Members with further disclosure that three Members were died, i.e., a final list of 56 Members.

14. The next election of General Body appears to be conducted on 19.08.2020 on basis of said list only and registration was renewed from 31.07.2020 to 31.07.2025, i.e., for five years. In between petitioners have conducted an election of Committee of Management on 30.07.2023 on basis of a list of 69 Members of General Body. This list is germane of dispute.

15. According to petitioners, name of dead Members and Members who have not paid Membership fees or remained absent in meetings were removed and some new Members were added and subsequently a list of 69 Members of General Body and later on a list of 51 Members of General Body of 2025-26 was presented which has finally deleted names of 19 deceased/ disqualified Members and 21 Members were newly inducted.

16. In aforesaid circumstances, an order dated 04.09.2025 was passed whereby election dated 30.07.2023 was not declared valid and accordingly list of 2025-26 was also cancelled as at that stage also petitioners have not submitted relevant documents in support of deletion of Members as well as inclusion of Members.

17. Said order was challenged before this Court by way of filing Writ-C No. 36738 of 2025 and impugned order dated 04.09.2025 was set aside on ground that petitioners were not given ample opportunity to place their case and said order was passed only on basis of contentions of complainant.

18. In aforesaid circumstances, a fresh order dated 23.01.2026 was passed after hearing both parties and earlier order was reiterated that

petitioners were failed to provide relevant documents that how names of 19 Members were deleted being deceased/ disqualified and how names of 21 Members were newly inducted.

19. The contention of learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of petitioners is mainly that in the garb of fresh consideration under Section 4-B of Societies Registration Act, not only list of 69 Members of General Body was found to be incorrect but election conduction on its basis was also cancelled which was beyond the jurisdiction of Deputy Registrar under Section 4-B and for that there must be another proceeding.

20. Per contra, crux of argument of learned Senior Advocate appearing for private respondents is that since petitioners were not able to show requisite documents in order to prove how new Members were inducted as well as that even the Members who were not dead were shows as dead, therefore, Deputy Registrar has rightly passed impugned order.

21. In aforesaid circumstances, the Court takes note of Section 4-B of Societies Registration Act, 1860, which has already referred in earlier part of this judgment that Registrar can examine the correctness of list of General Body of a Society on basis of register members of said Body and minutes book thereof, cash book, receipt book of membership fee and bank pass book of Society.

22. Earlier when list was registered there is no reference, whether such exercise was undertaken and list was registered with a specific condition that if subsequently it came to knowledge that there was improper deletion and induction of Members, then order can be recalled, therefore, any argument that Deputy Registrar has no power to recall its order is incorrect.

23. In aforesaid circumstances, now the Court has to see, whether petitioners who have to discharge the burden of proof that exercise for induction of new Members was undertaken by a due process as well as

name of only dead Members were deleted have discharged the burden or not.

24. There is a specific affidavit of a Member, whose name was deleted on ground that he expired, whereby he has declared that he is still alive, which has been specifically mentioned in impugned order that one Daya Shankar Mishra by a notarized affidavit dated 20.08.2025 has declared that he is alive. This declaration has not been denied in writ petition except in paragraph no. 31 that his name was deleted on account of non deposit of yearly subscription. However, petitioners have not referred any such clause in bye laws that if a Member failed to deposit yearly subscription, his life Membership can be cancelled. Therefore, the reason referred in para 31 of writ petition itself does not sustain and proceeding to that effect is also not placed on record.

25. Similarly, petitioners have not annexed any document in support of their claim about induction of 19 new Members. Neither proceeding was placed before this Court nor before Deputy Registrar, as specifically mentioned in impugned order and for the sake of repetition relevant finding in this regard as mentioned in impugned order is reproduced hereinafter:

"याचीगण सोसा०रजि०अधि० 1860 की धारा 4 बी के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत वर्ष 2020-21 की साधारण सभा में किये गये परिवर्तनों की शुद्धता की जांच हेतु वांछित संस्था के मूल अभिलेख धारा 4 बी (1) में किया गया है, को प्रस्तुत नहीं कर सके हैं।"

26. There is no specific denial to said finding so much as that it can be considered perverse as well as, as referred above, petitioners have not placed any document. The Court also takes note of averments made in para 31 of writ petition that name of 19 life Members were not shown in the list of 2014-15 though it is not specifically denied that their names were recorded in list of 2015-16 and this is also not the reason for their removal.

27. Court also takes note of a communication dated 11.09.2025 wherein an objection was filed that names of 11 Members were deleted

in terms of Clause 6-Ga of bye laws since they have failed to deposit subscription for their Membership and remained absent without information. However, Court finds that Clause 6-Ga does not provide any reason for deletion of name, rather it provides how a new Member of General Body would become eligible to cast vote.

28. So far as Clause 16-Gha of bye laws is concerned, it provides that in case any Member remained absent in three continuous meeting of General Body, he would be an ineligible for becoming a Member. However, even in such condition there must be a proposal adopted by 2/3 Members of General Body but there is no document to this effect.

29. Therefore, the Court finds that Deputy Registrar while conducting inquiry about deletion of name of life Members and induction of new Members, in absence of relevant documents has not committed any illegality when such disputed list was found defective and since election was conducted on a defective list, therefore, the same cannot be legally sustainable and it was rightly set aside by impugned order.

30. In view of above, I do not find any reason to interfere with impugned order. The second writ petition, i.e., Writ-C No. 13322 of 2026, is also accordingly dismissed.

May 06, 2026
AK

(Saurabh Shyam Shamshery,J.)