2026:HHC:30055

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWPIL No. 94 of 2025
Date of Decision: 20.07.2026

Ajay Bhaik .....*Petitioner*

Versus

State of H.P & others .....*Respondents*

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice G.S. Sandhawalia, Chief Justice.
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Bipin C. Negi, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? *Yes.*

For the Petitioner :	Mr. Ajay Sharma, Senior Advocate with Mr. Atharv Sharma, Advocate.
For the respondents:	Mr. Pranay Pratap Singh, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No. 1 & 2.
	Mr. Suneel Mohan Goel, Senior Advocate with Mr. Raman Jamalta, Advocate.

G.S. Sandhawalia, Chief Justice.

In the present Public Interest Litigation, the petitioner seeks to challenge the proceedings and action of respondent No. 3-the Himachal Pradesh State Cooperative Bank Ltd. (for short ‘the respondent-Bank) of procurement, installation or implementation of the Finacle 10.02.25 Core Banking Software (CBS) from Infosys Ltd. or any other vendor, without initiating an independent and transparent tendering process. The resolution of the respondent-Bank to procure Core Banking Software (CBS) for Finacle Make from the respondent No. 5-Infosys vide Board Resolution passed on 06.08.2022 in its 410th Board Meeting at Item No. 33 is thus also suffering from a challenge.

2. An independent inquiry is thus sought by a Committee appointed by a Court or any competent authority into the decision-making process followed by the respondent-Bank in adopting National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development's (for short 'the NABARD') Request for Proposal (RFP) and resultant directions are sought to ensure that all future procurements are undertaken by the said Bank through open, transparent and product-neutral competitive bidding process in strict conformity with the Central Vigilance Commission Guidelines, the General Financial Rules, the H.P. Financial Rules, 2009, and notifications of the respondent-State issued from time to time.

3. In order to show his *bona fide* as such, the petitioner has alleged that he is a private Contractor for the last more than 20 years and a Member of the Himalayan Natural Beauty Adventure and Tourism Co-operative Limited, which in turn is the Member of the respondent-Bank. The Society of the petitioner is a shareholder with the respondent-Bank and as such is entitled to a share in the dividends declared by the respondent-Bank. It is averred that he has means to pay the costs, if any, imposed by this Court and in such circumstances, the petition has been filed.

4. It is appropriate to mention that keeping in view the commercial nature of the dispute as such, we had directed the petitioner to deposit a sum of Rs. 2.00 lacs in the Registry to show his *bona fide* to examine the issue on merits and to file an affidavit as to whether software sought to be installed is readily available with the GeM Portal or not vide order dated 22.09.2025.

5. Supplementary affidavit was accordingly filed by the petitioner, wherein it has been mentioned that the Finacle Make of Core Bank Software is not readily available with the GeM Portal of the Union of India and the RFP dated

27.10.2023 floated by respondent No. 4-NABARD shows that the Financle 10.2.25 Core Banking Software had been obtained by NABARD through GeM Portal on Competitive Bidding.

6. In the present case, it is alleged that the respondent-Bank had allotted the said Award to respondent No. 6-Dynacons Systems & Solution Ltd., the subsidiary of respondent No. 5-Infosys, for a sum of more than Rs. 45.00 crores merely on the ground that the earlier tender stood allotted to respondent No. 5-Infosys by the NABARD. The respondent-Bank had requested the three Companies, namely Infosys, Oracle and TCS Bancs, which were providing Finacle Services, for demonstration and out of the said three Companies, only two Companies, i.e. Oracle and Infosys had responded and given live demonstration at the Head Office of the respondent-Bank and thereafter, a decision had been taken to switch to Infosys Financle 10.2.25 on account of the fact that the NABARD had the same driven Software Technology.

7. On notice having been issued, reply has also been filed by the respondent No. 3-Bank as such and the

NABARD was proceeded against *ex-parte*, not having put in appearance despite service, as apparently, no relief had been sought against it.

8. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner ably assisted by Mr. Athrav Sharma, Advocate, has thus argued on the strength of the pleadings that procurement of the Finacle 10.02.25 CBS to respondent No. 6-Dynacons Systems & Solution Ltd., the subsidiary of respondent No. 5, had been issued without following the Central Vigilance Commission Office Memorandum dated 27.12.2002, which provided pre-qualification criteria as such, which had been circulated to all Societies.

9. Similarly, a reference has been made to General Financial Rules, 2017, issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Finance Department of Expenditure (Annexure P-3) by referring to Rule 144 that for public buying (for all procurements including procurement or works, offers) should be invited following a fair, transparent and reasonable procedure.

10. Similarly, while relying upon the Himachal Pradesh Financial Rules, 2009 (Annexure P-4), reference is

made to Chapter 6-Procurement of Goods and Services, to point out that there must be transparency in matters relating to public procurement. Reference is also made to Rule 131 of the said Rules that in an exceptional situation to hire consultancy services from a specific consultant, Head of the Department may do so in consultation with the Finance Department through the Administrative Department by giving the detailed justification specifying therein the circumstances leading to the hiring of services and the special interest or purpose it may serve.

11. While taking us through the communication dated 04.09.2018 (Annexure P-5), it is pointed that the Controller of Stores, Himachal Pradesh Shimla had issued instructions/guidelines for procurement of Goods and Services for the offices from GeM portal.

12. It was further argued that the Bank had sought to adopt the CBS platform while placing reliance upon NABARD's RFP, dated 28.10.2023, which was not applicable and binding upon it, which had been adopted by 58 State Co-operative Banks and 9 Central Co-operative Banks in nine States, which had been done on 27.10.2023 (Annexure

P-7) and the respondent-Bank was never participant or beneficiary of this RFP, which would be clear from Annexure P-8, wherein there is a List of Banks and Branches, whereby the CBS Cloud facilitated by the NABARD showed the details of the said 58 Banks across the Country.

13. Reliance was also placed upon the information sought under the Right to Information Act, 2005 by a concerned citizen from the respondent-Bank and was supplied on 21.12.2024, wherein admission had been made that as per the RTI application dated 26.11.2024 regarding Item No. 33-minutes of the 410th meeting of the Board of Directors, which had been supplied to show that the Bank had decided to adopt the latest CBS software and decision had been taken to go for the NABARD's driven software I.e Infosys (Finacle 10.02.25), the latest version under the NABARD umbrella instead of floating a RFP.

14. Resultantly, as pointed out from the discussion which was held by the Board of Directors in its 410th meeting, only two Companies, i.e. Oracle (developed by Oracle) and Infosys Oracle(developed by Infosys) had shown their keenness and the third Company, i.e TCS Bancs

(developed by TATA Consultancy) had not responded and that live demonstration of the Core Banking Solutions was held on 7th and 8th July, 2022 by Oracle and on 14th and 15th July, 2022 by Infosys in the Head Office of the respondent-Bank.

15. Reference was accordingly made to the cost of the installation of the said Software alongwith training cost, recurring monthly cost and licence cost etc.

16. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has accordingly argued that the procurement of the said Software as such was against the procedure prescribed as mentioned above and, therefore, there is arbitrariness and contended, while placing reliance upon the judgments of the Apex Court in ***Tata Cellular Vs. Union of India (1994) 6 SCC 651*** and ***A.K. Kraipak Vs. Union of India, AIR 1970 SC 150,*** that administrative decisions with civil consequences must be made with fairness and transparency.

Defence and stand of the respondent-Bank:

17. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent No. 3 has pointed out that before going into the merits of

the issue, an important aspect, which has to be seen is the lack of public interest in a litigation, which is not *bona fide*, but is parmount being a motivated proceeding. It is pointed out that the information which was relied upon and had been obtained under the Right to Information Act, was supplied to one Delhi based Advocate, which would be clear from Annexure P-9.

18. It is pointed out that how these documents came into the possession of the petitioner, is a serious suppression, since the same documents were also appended with Writ Petition (C) No. 9287 of 2025, filed by Natural Support Consultancy Services Private Limited before the High Court of Delhi, wherein a request had been made to quash RFP/Tender dated 28.10.2023 and to issue fresh procurement proceedings. Copy of the said writ petition has been appended to the reply of the respondent-Bank as Annexure R-1. It has been pointed out that the writ petition had been dismissed as withdrawn on 8th July, 2025 (Annexure R-2), whereas the present petition had been filed on 11th July, 2025 and registered on 20th September, 2025.

19. It is accordingly argued that the petitioner has no independent grievance and is merely acting at the behest of others and thus, the petition is a gross abuse of the process of law and deserves outright dismissal.

20. It is submitted that the petitioner's grievances relating to the functioning of the Bank, by way of a Public Interest Litigation bypassing the statutory remedy would not maintainable, as it falls within the ambit of Co-operative Societies Act and Bank's bylaws. It is accordingly, submitted that the NABARD had a Pan-India RFP for 58 Banks and Dynacons-respondent No. 6 had been selected through Open Competitive Bidding and the bank had adopted a negotiated, regulatory approved CBS modernization framework, a specialized regulatory process recognized by RBI. The Centralized Regulatory Driven Technology Modernization Project was intended to bring all co-operative banks under a common technology umbrella and the exercise had been conducted by the supervisory Authority of NABARD.

21. The RBI had given adverse findings on the existing BancMate CBS, vide letter dated 14.01.2022

(Annexure R-3), which fact the petitioner has deliberately suppressed. The NABARD vide letter dated 09.08.2022 (Annexure R-4) had requested the respondent-Bank to align its policy in line at par with the national CBS platform and since a competitive bidding process had already been completed, the same had been followed and the centralized procurement harmonization already operates across India for Co-operative Banks. Dynacons was stated to be not a subsidiary of Infosys, but the System Integrator selected through the NABARD's competitive bidding and no subletting had been done. Resultantly, the petition as such was opposed, in sub and substance.

Reasons for dismissal:

22. The Apex Court in ***Janta Dal Vs. H.S. Chaudhari, (1992) 4 SCC 305,*** has held that the power under Public Interest Litigation has to be exercised where there is the public, or a class or the community having some interests affected and notion of 'access to justice has been highlighted, that it should be for the betterment of the public at large and vexatious and frivolous litigation have also to be kept in mind and the jurisdiction should not be

misused and should not be vindicating any personal grievance. The seed of the concept of PIL had been initially sown by Justice Krishna Iyer in ***Mumbai Kamgar Sabha Vs. Abdulbhai (1976) SCC (3) 832,*** had been kept in mind and thus, it was noticed that the issue of the bribe of kick-backs in Bofors gun purchase was an issue of public importance. The cutting short of the criminal proceedings by resorting to Public Interest Litigation would not be justified.

23. In ***Ashok Kumar Pandey Vs. State of Bengal, (2004) 3 SCC 349,*** the Apex Court has held that Public Interest Litigation is a weapon which has to be used with great care and circumspection and should be aimed at redressal of genuine public wrong or public injury and a petition actuated by a desire to win notoriety or cheap popularity and that of busy bodies deserve to be thrown out by rejection at the threshold. In appropriate cases, exemplary costs have to be imposed and *bona fide* of the person approaching the Court has to be seen that it is not for personal gain or private profit or political motivation or other oblique consideration. Reference can be made to the

relevant paragraphs of the aforesaid judgment, which read as under.

> "12. *Public interest litigation is a weapon which has to be used with great care and circumspection and the judiciary has to be extremely careful to see that behind the beautiful veil of public interest an ugly private malice, vested interest and/or publicity seeking is not lurking. It is to be used as an effective weapon in the armory of law for delivering social justice to the citizens. The attractive brand name of public interest litigation should not be used for suspicious products of mischief. It should be aimed at redressal of genuine public wrong or public injury and not publicity oriented or founded on personal vendetta. As indicated above, Court must be careful to see that a body of persons or member of public, who approaches the court is acting bona fide and not for personal gain or private motive or political motivation or other oblique consideration. The Court must not allow its process to be abused for oblique considerations. Some persons with vested interest indulge in the pastime of meddling with judicial process either by force of habit or from improper motives. Often they are actuated by a desire to win notoriety or cheap popularity. The petitions of such busy bodies deserve to be thrown out by rejection at the threshold, and in appropriate cases with exemplary costs.*
>
> *13...............x...........x.................x...........x.............*
>
> *14. The Court has to be satisfied about (a) the credentials of the applicant; (b) the prima facie*

correctness or nature of information given by him; (c) the information being not vague and indefinite. The information should show gravity and seriousness involved. Court has to strike balance between two conflicting interests; (i) nobody should be allowed to indulge in wild and reckless allegations besmirching the character of others; and (ii) avoidance of public mischief and to avoid mischievous petitions seeking to assail, for oblique motives, justifiable executive actions. In such case, however, the Court cannot afford to be liberal. It has to be extremely careful to see that under the guise of redressing a public grievance, it does not encroach upon the sphere reserved by the Constitution to the Executive and the Legislature. The Court has to act ruthlessly while dealing with imposters and busy bodies or meddlesome interlopers impersonating as public-spirited holy men. They masquerade as crusaders of justice. They pretend to act in the name of Pro Bono Publico, though they have no interest of the public or even of their own to protect.

15. ....x............x.............x...............x........x.....

16 As noted supra, a time has come to weed out the petitions, which though titled as public interest litigations are in essence something else. It is shocking to note that Courts are flooded with large number of so called public interest litigations where even a minuscule percentage can legitimately be called as public interest litigations. Though the parameters of *public interest litigation have been indicated by this Court in large number of cases, yet unmindful of the real intentions and objectives, Courts are entertaining such petitions and wasting valuable judicial time which, as noted above, could be otherwise utilized for disposal of genuine cases. Though in Dr. Duryodhan Sahu & others Vs. Jitendra Kumar Mishra & others, (AIR 1999 SC 114), this Court held that in service matters PILs should not be entertained, the inflow of so- called PILs involving service matters continues unabated in the Courts and strangely are entertained. The least the High Courts could do is to throw them out on the basis of the said decision. The other interesting aspect is that in the PILs, official documents are being annexed without even indicating as to how the petitioner came to possess them. In one case, it was noticed that an interesting answer was given as to its possession. It was stated that a packet was lying on the road and when out of curiosity the petitioner opened it, he found copies of the official documents. Whenever such frivolous pleas are taken to explain possession, the Court should do well not only to dismiss the petitions but also to impose exemplary costs. It would be desirable for the Courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as afore-stated so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the Courts."*

24. In ***State of Uttranchal Vs. Balwant Singh Chaufal & others (2010) 3 SCC 402,*** similar principles

were laid down by the Apex Court to show that a Public Interest Litigation should involve larger public interest, gravity and urgency, the court should be *prima facie* satisfied regarding the correctness of the contents of the petition before entertaining a PIL. The petitions filed by busy bodies for extraneous and ulterior motives were held to be discouraged by imposing exemplary costs or by adopting similar novel methods to curb frivolous petitions and the petitions filed for extraneous considerations. The principles regarding frivolous public interest litigation laid down in the said judgment read as under:

> "***ABUSE OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION:***
>
> *143. Unfortunately, of late, it has been noticed that such an important jurisdiction which has been carefully carved out, created and nurtured with great care and caution by the courts, is being blatantly abused by filing some petitions with oblique motives. We think time has come when genuine and bona fide public interest litigation must be encouraged whereas frivolous public interest litigation should be discouraged. In our considered opinion, we have to protect and preserve this important jurisdiction in the larger interest of the people of this court but we must take effective steps to prevent and cure its abuse on the basis of monetary and non-monetary directions by the Court.*
>
> *144 to 180.........*

181 We have carefully considered the facts of the present case. We have also examined the law declared by this court and other courts in a number of judgments. In order to preserve the purity and sanctity of the PIL, it has become imperative to issue the following directions:-

> (1) The courts must encourage genuine and bona fide PIL and effectively discourage and curb the PIL filed for extraneous considerations.
>
> (2) Instead of every individual judge devising his own procedure for dealing with the public interest litigation, it would be appropriate for each High Court to properly formulate rules for encouraging the genuine PIL and discouraging the PIL filed with oblique motives. Consequently, we request that the High Courts who have not yet framed the rules, should frame the rules within three months. The Registrar General of each High Court is directed to ensure that a copy of the Rules prepared by the High Court is sent to the Secretary General of this court immediately thereafter.
>
> (3) The courts should prima facie verify the credentials of the petitioner before entertaining a P.I.L.
>
> (4) The court should be prima facie satisfied regarding the correctness of the contents of the petition before entertaining a PIL.
>
> (5) The court should be fully satisfied that substantial public interest is involved before entertaining the petition.
>
> (6) The court should ensure that the petition which involves larger public interest, gravity

> *and urgency must be given priority over other petitions.*
>
> *(7) The courts before entertaining the PIL should ensure that the PIL is aimed at redressal of genuine public harm or public injury. The court should also ensure that there is no personal gain, private motive or oblique motive behind filing the public interest litigation.*
>
> *(8) The court should also ensure that the petitions filed by busybodies for extraneous and ulterior motives must be discouraged by imposing exemplary costs or by adopting similar novel methods to curb frivolous petitions and the petitions filed for extraneous considerations."*

25. In ***Tehseen Poonawal Vs. Union of India (2018) 6 SC 72,*** the three-Judge Bench of the Apex Court had come to the conclusion that if a person has no personal interest in the outcome of the proceedings and only has the general standing, the objectivity in the governance has to be taken into consideration and by relaxing the traditional rule of standing through Public Interest Litigation could be entertained and in the cases of business rivalry the Court would not step in.

26. In the present case, a Similar litigation had been initiated before the Delhi High Court by Natural Support

Consultancy Services Private Limited, in which the respondent-Bank was also arrayed as respondent No. 10 alongwith various other Co-operative Banks across the country. The challenge was to the RFP/Tender dated 28th October, 2023 floated by respondent No. 2-the NABARD and that it should not participate or influence the vendor selection process of the Co-operative Banks.

27. Infosys Limited was also arrayed as respondent No. 3 in the said petition, wherein specific issue as such as that the entire RFP/tender process initiated, in which conditions were neither justified nor necessary for achieving the objectives, had direct effect of excluding qualified bidders like the petitioners.

28. Reliance had also been placed in the said case upon the information supplied by the respondent-Bank under Right to Information Act, dated 21.12.2024 (Annexure P-7). We have gone through the contents of the said Annexure and have come to the conclusion that it is the same Annexure which has also been appended as Annexure P-9 in the present petition and there is the reference of the

same Advocate stationed in New Delhi and the averment made in the present petition is that the information under the Right to Information Act as such was supplied in reply to the query filed by the concerned citizen.

29. It is thus apparent that the petition, as noticed above, was filed before the Delhi High Court was dismissed as withdrawn on 08.07.2025 (Annexure R-2). The said order reads as under:-

> *"1. After arguing at some length, learned Senior Advocate representing the petitioner, on instructions, seeks to withdraw the writ petition.*
>
> *2. Accordingly, writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn."*

30. The present petition, as noticed above, was thereafter filed before this Court on 11.07.2025 and apparently, there is a strange co-incidence that similar relief as such has been sought and the Bank was also a party before the Delhi High Court regarding installation of the CBS by all the Co-operative Banks at the instance of NABARD, which is being supplied by Infosys.

31. It is pertinent to notice that the NABARD as such in its communication dated 09.08.2022 (Annexure R-4) has also written to the respondent-Bank that Co-operative Banks in Himachal Pradesh need to explore the proposed umbrella of NABARD CBS Plus activities before undertaking any CBS related exercise/updation effort and had requested to align its policy in line with their endeavour towards a national CBS platform. The same reads as under:-

> "*राबै. हि.प्र.क्षे.का. डी.एफ.आइ.बी.टी/686/-हि.प्र.रा.स. बैंक/2022-23*
>
> *दिनांक 09 अगस्त 2022*
>
> *प्रबंध निदेशक*
>
> *हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य सहकारी बैंक मॉल, शिमला-171001 हिमाचल प्रदेश*
>
> *महोदय*
>
> ***Renewal of CBS in cooperative and CBS plus activities***
>
> *Please refer to your BoD resolution no. 42 dated 21.03.2022 wherein Bank has decided for installation of Finacle make (latest solution) of core banking solution in the Bank and further the VC held with NABARD HO on 02nd August 2022 on Renewal of CBS in cooperatives and CBS plus activities.*
>
> *NABARD is contemplating implementation of unified CBS platform with cutting edge technology features in Rural Cooperative Banks across the country so as to have uniformity and features, in line with the CBS platform implemented in the Nationalised and Private banks. We feel that Cooperative Banks in Himachal*

> *Pradesh need to explore the propose umbrella of NABARD CBS Plus initiatives before undertaking any CBS related*mis *exercise updation effort.*
>
> *In this regard, we request you to please align your policy in line with our endeavor tow national CBS platform.*
>
> *भवदीय*
>
> *sd/*
> *विवेक पठानियाँ*
> *(महाप्रबंधक)"*

32. In such circumstances, it is apparent that the present litigation is not a genuine litigation and thus would not be covered under the provisions of the law laid down in ***Tata Cellular's*** *(supra)*, as argued by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. Once this Court is not satisfied with the genuineness as such of the litigation and the fact that it is only an effort to derail the CBS system being installed at national level to ensure financial security, certainty and efficiency at the hands of the respondent-Bank, this Court does not agree with the arguments raised that the process of not calling an open tender as such, would deserve to be examined at the hands of the petitioner as he cannot be treated as a genuine propagator for a down-trodden person furthering the cause of public interest.

33. It is not disputed that huge financial stakes are involved apparently on the installation of the said Software and would involve the recurring costs which would be clear from the information supplied, which reads as under:-

"The Committee calculated the tentative cost of the project as under:

Sr. No.	Particular	Price Offered	Tentative Cost
1.	**One Time cost ((OTC) for Implementation** Finacle v 10.2.25 Implementation including Server, Storage, NOc, SOC, application installation, DRG, BPD UAT/SIT, data migration and Integration development and go-live support	Rs.4,50,00,000.00	Rs.4,50,00,000.00
2.	**Training Cost** 2 Batches	Rs. 20,00,000	Rs. 20,00,000.00
3.	**Recurring Monthly cost-** Infrastructure, NOc, SOC L2 & L-3 support, Finacle L2 Support Per Branch Per Month Cost (PBPM) for 272 branches/EC	20,000	Rs. 6,52,80,000.00
4.	Licence cost as applicable to other Banks per branch per month for 272 branches/EC	Rs. 3540	Rs.1,15,54,560.00
	Total		**Rs.12,38,34,560.00**

34. The fact remains that the CBS Software is a highly technical software and it is only supplied by three Companies in the country and, therefore, the business

rivalry as such is apparent which would also be clear from the earlier litigation, which has been attempted before the Delhi High Court, so that the CBS Software is not installed Pan India in the Co-operative Banks under the ageis of NABARD.

35. In pursuance of the judgment passed in ***Balwant Singh Chaufal*** *(supra)*, the Himachal Pradesh High Court (Public Interest Litigation) Rules, 2021 were notified on 04.10.2021, which prescribed guidelines for screening Letter Petitions and the categories which will not be entertained as Public Interest Litigation. Rules 7 (iv) states that a letter petition shall not be entertained as a Public Interest Litigation pertaining to the disputes relating to contractual or statutory liabilities. Under Part III, Instructions for filing of Public Interest Litigation as per Rule 9(i)(b), a specific averment has to be made that the writ petitioner has no personal interest in the litigation and that the petition is not guided by self-gain or for gain of any other person/institution/body and that there is no motive other than public interest in filing of the same. Similarly, under Rule 9(i)(c), the source of knowledge of the facts

mentioned in the writ petition and inquiries/investigation, if any made to determine the veracity of the same, has to be mentioned.

36. As noticed above, the source and veracity of the person regarding knowledge of facts herein, have not been rebutted in any manner, once it has not been mentioned in the rejoinder (*sic* replication) filed as to how the said information was also made available to the petitioner. It has also been mentioned that since it is annexed in the court of law in the writ petition and circulated, the timing as such of the first litigation filed and the second litigation, has already been noticed and therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the explanation as such is not justified and apparently, there is deep-rooted motive in filing of the petition, guided by self-gain or for the gain of any other person/institution. Therefore, we are not inclined to entertain the petition as such keeping in view the above facts and circumstances, which have been brought to our notice.

37. In these circumstances, we find that it is not a fit case to entertain this petition, rather a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/-

which was deposited before the Registry, needs to be forfeited to ensure that such frivolous litigations do not subvert the system of this Court. Resultantly, we dismiss this Public Interest Litigation and direct that a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- already deposited before the Registry of this Court, is forfeited, out of which 1,00,000/- would go to the High Court Employees' Welfare Association Fund and 1,00,000/- to IGMC's poor patients fund.

38. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(G.S. Sandhawalia)
Chief Justice

(Bipin C. Negi)
Judge

July 20, 2026.
(Hem Lata)