



\$~12

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

Date of Decision: 02nd July, 2026

Uploaded on: 6th July, 2026

+ **W.P.(C) 8123/2026 and CM APPL. 38700/2026**

**DELHI URBAN COOPERATIVE BANKS
FEDERATION LTD**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Nandrajog, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Rajesh Srivastava,
Advocate.

versus

**REGISTRAR COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES
AND ORS**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Panel Counsel
(Civil) with Mr. Dhruv Kumar and
Mrs. Chandrika Sachdeva, Advocates.
(M) 9891558131

**CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN**

Prathiba M. Singh, J. (Oral)

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed by the Petitioner under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, assailing the impugned order dated 26th May, 2026 (*hereinafter, 'the impugned order'*) passed by the Registrar Cooperative Societies (*hereinafter, 'RCS'*)
3. *Vide* the impugned order, the RCS has appointed one Mr. Sumit as the Administrator-cum-Returning Officer for the Delhi Urban Co-operative



Banks Federation Ltd. (*hereinafter, 'the Petitioner Federation*).

4. A brief background of the present petition is that, the Petitioner federation had an elected Managing Committee, which had its term till 5th May, 2026. The Petitioner federation consists of only 13 members and had filed an application dated 12th January, 2026, seeking appointment of a Returning Officer.

5. For whatever reason, the RCS did not appoint the Returning officer, and *vide* the impugned order dated 26th May, 2026, appointed an Administrator-cum-Returning Officer.

6. Ld. Sr. Counsel for the Petitioner-federation has raised an objection that the Managing Committee has in fact been taken over/superseded by the Administrator-cum-Returning Officer for no cogent reason, and such a drastic measure was not required to be taken, as the Petitioner-federation had itself been requesting for appointment of a Returning Officer, since January, 2026 itself. The appointment of an Administrator is necessitated only when the Managing Committee is either perpetuating itself or is not acting in the interest of the Society.

7. Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Id. Panel Counsel for the RCS has made the following submissions:

- (i) Since the term of the existing Managing Committee has come to an end, an Administrator-cum-Returning Officer was appointed;
- (ii) That the impugned order is an appealable order, and an alternate remedy ought to be availed of;
- (iii) That the resolution for filing the present petition is *non-est* as the Managing Committee's term had come to an end.



9. Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner-Federation submits that there is no alternate remedy against the impugned order.
10. The Court has considered the submissions made by the Id. Counsels for the parties.
11. Clearly, the resolution of the Managing Committee was passed on 8th January, 2026 itself, for making a request to the RCS to appoint a Returning Officer to conduct the elections of the Petitioner-federation. Thereafter, an application was filed on 12th January, 2026.
12. If there were any deficiencies in the said application, the RCS could have asked Petitioner-federation to cure the said deficiencies and forthwith appointed the Returning Officer.
13. Instead of appointing a Returning Officer, the RCS appears to have waited for the term of the Managing Committee to end and has thereafter chosen to appoint an Administrator-cum-Returning Officer.
14. In the overall facts, the appointment of an Administrator-cum-Returning Officer is totally unwarranted. Appointment of only a Returning Officer would have sufficed.
15. Insofar as the alternate remedy is concerned, this Court is of the opinion that the writ petition deserves to be entertained, as the election ought to be conducted in an expeditious manner, and ought not to await disposal of any appeal against the impugned order, which could further delay the constitution of the new Managing Committee.
16. Insofar as the Resolution for the filing of the present petition is concerned, all the 13 Petitioners could have themselves filed the present petition, but they have chosen to pass a resolution, unanimously. Thus, the same would only be a technical objection.



17. Accordingly, the following directions are issued:
- (i) The concerned Section Officer, Mr. Sumit shall function as only the Returning Officer for conducting the elections;
 - (ii) He shall draw-up an electoral roll and the agenda for the conduct of the elections;
 - (iii) The said officer shall schedule and hold the elections within one month from this order;
 - (iv) In the meantime, the funds of the society shall only be used for day-to-day expenses and towards expenses for conducting the elections.
 - (v) Upon conduct of the elections, the results shall be declared and the new Managing Committee shall take over forthwith after declaration of results.
18. The present petition is disposed of in these terms. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE

VIKAS MAHAJAN
JUDGE

JULY 2, 2026/jg/sm