



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPMS/856/2025</u> Anand Foods Khasra No 560 And 562 Haldua Road --Petitioner Versus Reserve Bank Of India --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J</u> 1. Mr. Aditya Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. Shobhit Joshi, Advocate holding brief of Mr. Ashish Joshi, learned counsel for respondent no. 1. 3. Mr. Siddhartha Jain, learned counsel for respondent no. 2. 4. Petitioner has challenged order dated 27.06.2024 passed by Centralized Receipt and Processing Centre, Reserve Bank of India. By the said order, petitioner's complaint against Bank of Baroda was closed, observing that, similar complaint made by petitioner earlier has been decided. 5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the reason assigned for closing petitioner's complaint is not correct; he refers to a document dated 15.03.2024, enclosed as annexure 6 to the writ petition, for contending that the earlier complaint made by petitioner was not considered by Reserved Bank of India by holding that it is outside the purview of Reserve Bank – Integrated Ombudsman Scheme, 2021. 6. Learned counsel for Reserve Bank of



			India, however, has drawn attention of this Court to an order dated 13.06.2024 issued by Office of Reserve Bank of India Ombudsman, Reserve Bank of India, which is enclosed as Annexure CA-7 to the counter affidavit filed by Reserve Bank of India. Based on the said document, learned counsel appearing for Reserve Bank of India submits that earlier complaint made by petitioner was closed by holding that there was no deficiency in the service provided by Bank of Baroda. He, thus, submits that once a complaint, made by petitioner against Bank of Baroda has been decided on merit, then there was no occasion for Reserve Bank of India to entertain the subsequent complaint made by petitioner. 7. This Court finds substance in the submission made by learned counsel appearing for the Reserve Bank of India. Since the earlier complaint was closed, therefore, the subsequent complaint made by petitioner could not have been entertained. 8. In such view of the matter, there is no scope for interference in the matter. The writ petition is disposed of, however, petitioner shall be at liberty to approach appropriate forum, including State Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum. (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J) 21.09.2026 Aswal
--	--	--	---