



\$~3

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

+ W.P.(C) 663/2021

Date of Decision: **11.05.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

SARITA PANDEY GLOBAL FOUNDATIONPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr Vikram Jetly CGSC with Ms
Shreya Jetly, Advocates for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

“1. Revoking the order of discontinuation of Grant- in-Aid and Reinstating the FCC Project with the Petitioner NGO, as the discontinuation order by Respondent no 3 being against the Natural Justice Principle of Audi Altrem Partem, is Void Ab Initio.

2. Directing Respondent No 2 and 3 to give Sanction to the work already executed by NGO as per se Natural Justice and estoppels for period of 1st April 2016 to 31stMarch 2017 and Releasing the due Grant in-Aid that is Rs. 288,000.00, along with the Lawful Interests.

3. Directing the Respondent no 2 and 3 to ensure the crediting of the already sanctioned and released but yet unpaid Reimbursements of Rs 245330.00 along with the Lawful Interests for the period of lapse, to the Petitioner NGO's account.



4. *Grant of Payment for the damages caused to the reputation of Petitioner NGO and for the prolonged mental, emotional harassment and financial loss caused to the Petitioner NGO and its beneficiaries.*
5. *Directing/ guiding the Union of India through Respondent no 1 and 2 to revise their policies regarding the amount of Grant- in-Aid in accordance with the Basic Minimum wages, to stop Labor Exploitation of NGO employees and to stop misappropriations of funds.*
6. *Directing/guiding the Respondent no 1, 2 and 3 for imparting due behavioural training and orientation to the govt. officials in their administrative dealings with NGOs so that they aren't unduly coercive to the selflessly working NGOs and rather be polite and respectful to NGOs in accordance with their selfless nature of service.)”*

2. The petitioner is a Trust, registered under Public Trusts Act, 1882. Ms. Sarita Pandey is the chairperson and claims to be engaged in social welfare activities for women, children and unprivileged sections of society. Respondents are the Governmental authorities.

3. The petitioner was sanctioned a grant-in-aid to run Family Counselling Centre (hereinafter “**FCC**”) by respondent nos. 2 and 3- Central Social Welfare Board (hereinafter “**CSWB**”) under the instructions of respondent no. 1- the Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India.

4. The Scheme of FCC aims at engaging voluntary organizations to deliver professional support services in matters relating to family and social welfare. Further FCC encompasses functions such as providing timely crisis intervention, undertaking independent inquiries in matters pertaining to dowry death, offering counselling in family maladjustment and facilitating reconciliation between disputing parties etc.

5. The facts of the case would indicate that the first sanction for grant-in-aid was accorded in the year 2012-2013 *vide* Sanction letter dated 26.03.2013. The petitioner seems to have been accorded subsequent



extension for the years 2013-2014, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 *vide* letters dated 31.03.2014, 23.07.2014 and 13.11.2015 respectively.

6. It is, the case of the petitioner, that abruptly *vide* order dated 30.01.2017 passed by the Deputy Director (FCC) of the CSWB, the petitioner has been discontinued for grant with effect from 01.04.2016.

7. Ms. Sarita Pandey who appears on behalf of petitioner (hereinafter "***Petitioner in Person***") contends that by the time letter dated 30.01.2017 was received, the petitioner had already incurred sufficient expenses. The petitioner in person, thus, contends that the respondents ought not to have discontinued the grant with retrospective operation.

8. The petitioner has also made various prayers in the writ petition, however, during the course of hearing, the petitioner in person, submits that as of now she would not press the reliefs as stated in prayer nos. 1 to 4. However, she submits that the Court may consider to direct the respondents to examine the petitioner's actual expenses and if it is found that the petitioner has incurred the expenses, the same be directed to be reimbursed.

9. She also submits that respondents must consider to ensure that the grant-in-aid schemes should be framed bearing in mind the basic minimum wages in order to prevent the labour exploitation. Furthermore, the respondent nos.1, 2 and 3 must consider for imparting due behavioural training to the govt. officials in their administrative dealings with Trusts.

10. The submissions made by the petitioner in person are opposed by Mr. Vikram Jetly, learned counsel for respondents. He contends that the sanction was year to year basis and for the year 2016-2017, no sanction was accorded. He also points out from various inspection reports that the petitioner was not found entitled for grant of sanction, and, accordingly, *vide*



a communication dated 30.01.2017, the petitioner has been held to be not entitled for any reimbursement.

11. I have heard submissions made on behalf of the parties and have perused the record.

12. *Vide* order dated 08.01.2025, the Court has issued the following observations:

“Learned Standing Counsel for the respondent no.1 submits that prayer-3 sought in the present petition stands satisfied. He further submits that the remaining prayers have been rendered infructuous since the Ministry of Women & Child Development (MWCD), vide its memorandum dated 13.04.2023, has approved rationalisation of the Central Social Welfare Board. Consequently, a notification dated 04.04.2024 was published in the Gazette of India whereby all operations and activities of CSWB stand closed w.e.f. 30.11.2023. As such CSWB no longer exists, and its name has been struck off by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs.”

13. A perusal of the aforesaid would indicate that the Scheme in question no longer exists and the same has been struck off by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs.

14. For appreciation of the controversy, the chronology relating to grant-in-aid sanctions is reproduced in tabular form, the same reads as under:

TABLE OF DATE OF SANCTIONS OF GRANT - IN - AID			
S.No.	Sanction Order for Financial Year	Letter Issue Date	Timing of Sanction Orders
1	01.04.2012 - 31.03.2013	26.03.2013	End of Sanctioned Financial Year
2	01.04.2013 – 31.03.2014	31.03.2014	End of Sanctioned



			<i>Financial Year</i>
3	<i>01.04.2014 - 31.03.2015</i>	<i>23.07.2014</i>	<i>Mid of Sanctioned Financial Year</i>
4	<i>01.04.2015 – 31.03.2016</i>	<i>13.11.2015</i>	<i>Mid of Sanctioned Financial Year</i>
5	<i>01.04.2016 – 31.03.2017</i>	<i>Rejected on 30.01.2017</i>	<i>Mid of the year</i>

15. As is discernible from above extracted table that *vide* order dated 30.01.2017 the petitioner's entitlement has been discontinued for grant-in-aid with effect from 01.04.2016.

16. A bare perusal of aforesaid chronology would indicate, that the respondents as a matter of consistent practise used to accord the sanctions after commencement of the relevant Financial Year. The petitioner, thus, might have performed its obligation under the *bonafide* belief that subsequent to commencement of the particular financial year, the sanction may be granted. In that view of the matter, the petitioner should be held entitled for actual expenses, which it may have incurred in anticipation of sanction.

17. Denying the actual benefit would not be justified under the facts of the case. The respondents, thus, are directed to evaluate the petitioner's record in order to find out whether the petitioner has actually incurred any expenses before 30.01.2017. If the petitioner satisfies regarding incurring of the expenses, the respondents are directed to reimburse the same.

18. Accordingly, let the petitioner to submit a fresh representation along



2026:DHC:4389



with a copy of this before the respondents along with all relevant documents. Let the respondents to consider and pass an appropriate within a period of six weeks from the date of receiving a copy of this order.

19. With respect to the prayers 5 and 6 as prayed by the petitioner in person, she rightly contends as and when the respondents shall issue a fresh policy, it shall bear in mind the aspects highlighted by the petitioner. With these observations, nothing more is required to be adjudicated. Accordingly, the petition, along with pending applications, stands disposed of.

20. If the petitioner has any further grievance, it shall be entitled to make a representation for the same, which shall be considered in accordance with law.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

MAY 11, 2026/aks/ss