

FCRA

PROCEEDINGS OF IMPORTANT CASES



Prepared by
IDEAL Centre for Social Justice

Prepared for
CSO SUPPORT CELL

PROCEEDINGS OF IMPORTANT CASES

1. Greenpeace India Society Through Its Executive Director Vs. Union of India and another [W.P(C) 4887/2015]

Facts

Briefly, the petitioner were aggrieved by the fact that funds remitted to it by Green Peace International and Climate Works Foundation (in short GPICWF), via proper banking channel, i.e., IDBI Bank Ltd., have not been allowed to be accessed, based on directions of the respondents in particular, Ministry of Home Affairs. To access the same funds they wrote a letter on 04.07.2014 to the IDBI bank to ask the same to ministry and also followed it by an email on 29.07.2014. They also asked about any information in this regard that have come from RBI. The said funds were lying idle, and as a result of that interest was being lost on the amount remitted to it by its donor. The petitioner asserted that, if there were guidelines received from the RBI, regarding necessity to obtain prior concurrence from Ministry of Home Affairs, those should be made known to them. The ministry responded on 28.07.2014 asking the petitioner to furnish the information within a period of fifteen (15) days. The communication dated 28.07.2014, was in fact dispatched to the petitioner only on 04.09.2014. After the dispatch of communication dated 28.07.2014, yet another communication was sent by the respondents, which is dated 08.09.2014; This communication, apparently, was received on 12.09.2014. The sum and substance of this communication, was that, respondents indicated to the petitioner that they were seeking to exercise their powers u/s. 23 of the FCRA, and that, for this purpose, they had authorized a designated officer, who was holding Group 'A' post in the Government of India. The petitioner, by a return communication dated 15.09.2014, indicated to the Director, FCRA Division, in the Ministry of Home Affairs, that the inward remittance, which is in issue, was received from the Green Peace Council, Amsterdam, and that, the said remittance would be utilized by the petitioner as per its "aims and objects on environmental projects", as also for meeting, office expenses, payment of salaries, contingencies, travel, and other miscellaneous expenses.



Significant proceedings in details

The petitioner stated that are into legitimate activities and, therefore, denial of access to its bank account, is violative of its fundamental rights under the Constitution. Such an action of the respondents, is violative of Art. 14 of the Constitution, being completely in breach of principles of natural justice.

The respondents responded by saying that they do not have any issue with the petitioner accessing funds or receiving donations, generally, for carrying out its

activity. The problem that the respondents have, is with the donor, who is on the watch list of MHA which has remitted funds that lie with the IDBI Bank (Chennai branch).

According to the Judge there is no material whatsoever, on record, which would, justify, declining the petitioner's request for allowing it access to its bank account maintained with IDBI Bank (Chennai branch). The stand taken by the respondents that the donor, GPICWF, is on the "watch-list" of the Ministry of Home Affairs, is not enough, to reach such a conclusion. There is no material placed on record, which would show, not at least at this juncture, that the activities carried out by the petitioner, as claimed by the respondents, are detrimental to national interest. The petitioner's disagreement with the policies of the Government of India, could not, per se be construed as actions which are detrimental to national interest. Non-Governmental Organizations often take positions, which are contrary to the policies formulated by the Government of the day. That by itself cannot be used to portray, petitioner's action as being detrimental to national interest. The government is free to execute its policies as it has the mandate of the people behind it, notwithstanding a different point of view of Non-Governmental Organizations, such as the petitioner.

The proceedings of the case is as below.

EXEMPTION FROM FILING CERTIFIED COPIES ETC Filed By On Behalf of GREENPEACE INDIA SOCIETY	CM APPL.19898/2015		1
EXPARTE STAY/INJUNCTION/INTERIM STAY/STATUS QUO/I Filed By On Behalf of GREENPEACE INDIA SOCIETY	CM APPL.8846/2015	15MAY 2015	2
For EXEMPTION FROM FILING CERTIFIED COPIES ETC Filed By On Behalf of GREENPEACE INDIA SOCIETY	CM APPL.8847/2015	15MAY 2015	3
CM No. 8847/2015 (Exemption) Allowed subject to just exceptions. WP(C) 4887/2015 & CM No. 8846/2015 (Stay) PETITIONER COUNSEL SAID WILL FILE AFFIDAVIT INDICATION MONTHLY EXPENDITURE expenditure towards salaries, wages, electricity and other fixed and variable expenses, will be indicated in the said affidavit. counsel for respondent no.1. Mr Batra will obtain instructions, based on the details disclosed in the affidavit, as to how respondent no.1 intends to move forward in the matter with regard to release of funds for the day-today functioning of the petitioner.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER	18-MAY-2015	4
AFFIDAVIT Filed by CICERO CHAMBERS Vide Diary No : 250340/2015		19MAY 2015	5
Vakalatnama/Appearance Filed By KA RANJAWAL AND CO.		22MAY 2015	6
received AFF OF SERVICE FROM CICERO CHAMBERS ADV		23MAY 2015	7

CM APPL.10121/2015 For IMPLEADMENT Filed By S.D. WINDLESH On Behalf of GREENPEACE INDIA SOCIETY		25MAY 2015	8
List on 27.05.2015.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER	26MAY 2015	9
		27MAY 2015	10
MISCELLANEOUS Filed By CICERO CHAMBERS On Behalf of GREENPEACE INDIA SOCIETY	CM APPL.11626/ 2015	02JUL2 015	11
an application under Section 151 CPC for modification of order dated 27.05.2015. the amount of "Rs.3,75,383/- (Rupees Three lakhs seventy five thousand three hundred eighty three)" mentioned in para 1(iii) of order dated 27.05.2015 may be read as "Rs.2,00,868/- (Rupees Two lakhs eight hundred sixty eight)"	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.P.VAISH	06JUL2 015	12
MISCELLANEOUS Filed By CICERO CHAMBERS On Behalf of GREENPEACE INDIA SOCIETY	CM APPL.14373/ 2015	06AUG 2015	13
application under Section 151 CPC filed on behalf of petitioner seeking direction to respondent Nos.1 and 2 to remit/ transfer ₹148608 that was blocked by the incidental measure impugned in the writ petition transferred by Stitching Greenpeace Council to petitioner's FCRA Account No.005103000000888. Issue notice. the respondent seek time to file a reply of the notice. Let the reply be filed before the next date of hearing with advance copy to counsel for the petitioner.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.P.VAISH	10AUG 2015	14
AFFIDAVIT Filed by CICERO CHAMBERS Vide Diary No : 433204/2015		02SEP2 015	15
Vakalatnama/Appearance Filed By SANJAY BHATT. AFFIDAVIT Filed by ATUL BATRA On Behalf of Vide Diary No : 438805/2015 REPLY Filed by SANJAY BHATT On Behalf of Vide Diary No : 442523/2015		03SEP2 015	16
Adjournment is requested on behalf of the respondents for filing reply. The same is not opposed on behalf of the petitioner.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.P.VAISH	04SEP2 015	17
For MISCELLANEOUS Filed By S.D. WINDLESH On Behalf of GREENPEACE INDIA SOCIETY	CM APPL.19897/ 2015	14SEP2 015	18

<p>The counsel for the petitioner seeks liberty to withdraw this writ petition. the question whether the invocation of jurisdiction by the petitioner of the Madras High Court is proper or not is to be decided by the Madras High Court or by the Supreme Court and not by this Court. All the pleas, as taken by the learned ASG before this Court, would remain unaffected by allowing the withdrawal of this writ petition. The petitioner having chosen not to pursue this petition and having not sought any liberty from this Court, cannot be forced to pursue this petition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn with the following clarifications:</p> <p>(I) that with the withdrawal of the petition, the interim order will cease to have any effect and the petitioner having not pursued the petition to justify the interim order, it would remain open to the respondents to take whatever action may be permissible in law with respect to the transactions done under the interim order;</p> <p>(II) that all pleas to be taken by the respondent No.1 UOI before the Madras High Court and / or before the Supreme Court shall remain unaffected by this withdrawal.</p> <p>CM No. 19897/2015 has been filed by Rashtravadi Shiv Sena for rectification of the order dated 27th May, 2015 on its application being CM No.10121/2015 for impleadment in this petition. The applicant, on 27th May, 2015 had withdrawn the application for impleadment with liberty to make suitable representation to the government.</p> <p>The applicant, who was not even a party to the writ petition, would be at liberty to take whatever course of action it desires and for the reason of the applicant to agitate its grievance by becoming a party to this petition, the writ petition cannot be kept alive against the will of the petitioner.</p>	<p>HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW</p>	<p>17SEP2015</p>	<p>19</p>
--	---	------------------	-----------

2. Teesta Setalvad and another Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation Economic Offences Wing, Fort Mumbai and another [1057/2015]

Facts

The applicants/accused are the Directors of one company, namely, Sabrang Communication and Publishing Private Limited . The Company is working on the socio, economic issues on national level and the said company had sought funding in the nature of donations from foreign organisation i.e., Ford Foundation, to the tune of 290000 USD from 2004 by way of two agreements i.e., 2004 and 2006. As per the FCRA it is necessary for any organization working on such issues to seek permission of the Central Government; so also registration of such company under the Act is mandatory. The applicants are accused of having misused the said funds for their personal requirements. Letter was written by the Government of Gujarat dated 10.3.2015 to the Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Finance, Government of India, prosecution was initiated. The applicants made application for pre-arrest bail before the Special Judge, CBI, which was rejected by order dated 24.7.2015.



Significant proceedings in details

The applicants submitted that it is a matter of interpretation of statute and the two agreements dated 5.4.2014 and 22.9.2006 between the Ford Foundation and the Company. were for consultancy services and amount received is neither a donation nor a funding to the company. The company has rendered the services to Ford Foundation which has engaged the company as it wanted to take the services on certain issues i.e., of communalism and caste based discrimination in India through action research, web based information and dissemination and development civil society network and media strategies. For this purpose, the services of the company were engaged and a payment was fixed for such services. The applicants have been cooperating with the police in the investigation and, therefore, their custodial interrogation is not required. All the ledgers, books of accounts from 2004 are available and they are produced before the Investigating Agency and if required, the applicants are ready to produce all the documents.

Opposing anticipatory bail the respondent relied on the relevant portion of the Parliamentary debate which has taken place while introducing the amended Act of 2010. As the foreign countries are funding individuals, associations, publishers, newspapers and also giving hospitality, it needs to be regulated. The applicants/accused have criminal antecedents and custodial interrogation of these applicants/accused is necessary. Opposing application mainly on three counts - firstly, there is a violation of law; secondly, it is dangerous to the national safety and security and public interest and thirdly, that the custodial interrogation of the applicants/accused is necessary as they are not cooperating with the investigating agency.

The court deliberated on the question that if the company has violated the provisions of the Act, can now they avail the S.432?. The court was unable to find out any threat to sovereignty and integrity of India or threat to the security, strategic or economic interest of the State or public interest. Both the applicants are Indian nationals and hence no possibility of them fleeing from justice. So the court granted them bail as it could not find grounds where they were not cooperating.

The proceedings of the case are as follows:

<p>The learned counsel for the applicants/accused has submitted that the applicants/accused were given interim protection by the learned Sessions Judge by its order dated 17th July, 2015, however, the main Application is rejected by the Sessions Court today and interim protection granted is also vacated. The learned counsel for the applicants/accused prays for interim protection. He submitted that the applicants/accused have roots in Mumbai. The applicants are not having their passports with them, as they have deposited their passports with Gujarat Police in other case. This is the first date and as there was interim protection granted by the Sessions Court, interim protection to continue for two weeks. On conditions.</p>	<p>HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MRIDULA BHATKAR</p>	<p>24/07/2015</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Learned counsel for respondent no.1/CBI informs the Court that this matter is fixed on 10th August, 2015, however, Mr. Anil Singh is not in the town on that date and therefore, the matter is to be fixed on 11th August, 2015. the matter is fixed on 11th August, 2015. Interim relief granted earlier to continue till then.</p>	<p>HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MRIDULA BHATKAR</p>	<p>03/08/2015</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Custodial interrogation is not required and accordingly, I am inclined to allow the Anticipatory Bail Application on the following conditions:</p> <p>i) In the event of arrest, the applicants/accused shall be released on bail upon furnishing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/ -, with one or two sureties in the like amount;</p> <p>ii) The applicants shall not tamper with the evidence;</p> <p>iii) The applicants shall not indulge into any kind of offence especially under the provisions of the Foreign Contributions (Regulation) Act, 2010, while on bail;</p> <p>iv) The applicants shall cooperate with the Investigating Agency and report to their office at Mumbai, as and when called.</p> <p>v) The applicants/accused shall make themselves available to the investigating agency and supply proper address of their residence, whenever they leave Mumbai, till filing of chargesheet.</p> <p>vi) The applicants/accused shall not leave India, without permission of the Court.</p>	<p>HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MRIDULA BHATKAR</p>	<p>11/08/2015 (O-R)</p>	<p>3</p>
--	---	-----------------------------	----------

3. Indian Social Action Forum (INSAF) Vs. Union of India [W.P.(C)4982/2013]

Facts

The petitioner is a society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860. Vide order dated 30.4.2013 issued by the Director to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Foreigners Division (FCRA Wing), the permanent registration of the petitioner association was suspended in exercise of the powers conferred upon the Central Government u/s. 13 of the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 2010. While suspending the said registration, it was also directed that the petitioner association can utilize the funds available with it, only after taking prior permission of the Central Government in terms of S. 13(2)(b) of the FARA, 2010.



Significant proceedings in details

When the suspension order was passed on 30.04.2013, the Central Government had neither issued any notice of hearing/show-cause notice in terms of sub-s. (2) of S. 14 nor had it initiated any enquiry in terms of the said Section. Therefore, there was no occasion to suspend the certificate of the petitioner in terms of sub-s. (1) of S. 13 of the Act. For the very first time the petitioner was asked information vide letter dated 02.05.2013, i.e., after the registration of the petitioner-society had already been suspended. The suspension, therefore, was contrary to the scheme of the Act which envisaged such suspension only when the issue of cancellation is already pending consideration of the Central Government. The Central Government also failed to record the reasons which necessitated suspension of the certificate in terms of sub-s. (1) of S. 13 of the Act. The Central Government may or may not suspend the certificate of an organization, pending consideration of cancellation of the said certificate but, if the Government decides to suspend such certificate it can be done only for reasons to be recorded and such reasons, according to the court, need to be incorporated in the suspension order itself so that the organization is in a position to know what were the reasons which impelled the Government to suspend its registration and in case the organization feels that certificate has been suspended for the reasons which are not envisaged under sub-s. (1) of S. 13 or are not otherwise cogent, objective and transparent, it can challenge such suspension by way of appropriate proceedings.

The case proceedings are as follows:

AFFIDAVIT Filed by KABIR Vide Diary No : 119225/2013		08aug2013
For CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING PLEADINGS Filed By AMRIT PAL SINGH Vide Diary No : 139065/2013	CM APPL.12977/2013	12sep2013

The delay in filing the counter affidavit is condoned and the counter affidavit is taken on record. Application stands disposed of.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.K. JAIN	16sep2013
REJOINDER Filed by KABIR DIIT Vide Diary No : 142082/2013 Vakalatnama Filed by AMRIT PAL SINGH Vide Diary No : 141382/2013		17sep2013
Judgement	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.K. JAIN	19sep2013

4. Indian Social Action Forum (INSAF) Vs. Union of India [W.P.(C)-5793/2011]

Facts

The petitioner, Indian Social Action Forum (INSAF), has preferred this writ petition for declaring Sections 5(1) & 5(4) of the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 2010 (for brevity the Act) and Rules 3(i), 3(v) & 3(vi) of the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Rules, 2011 (for short the 2011 Rules) as ultra vires the Articles 14, 19(1)(a), 19(1)(c) and 21 of the Constitution of India.



Significant proceedings in details

According to the petitioner, section 5 of the Act uses very vague terms and has very wide umbrella thus is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution. By virtue of the proviso to Section 5(1) which stipulates that the Central Government may, by rules made by it, frame the guidelines specifying the ground or grounds on which an organisation shall be specified as an organisation of a political nature the legislature in actuality has abandoned its basic legislative power. The Rules have been framed, yet they really do not cover the situation envisaged by the terms, namely, activities, ideologies and programmes and, hence, the Rules travel beyond the conferment of power under the main provision making the same ultra vires of the Act. The term authority which has been mentioned in sub-section (4) of Section 5 has nowhere been defined and it is not clear whether the authority would be independent of the Central Government and thereby a state of uncertainty has crept in. Criticizing the validity of the Rules, it is contended that the guidelines specified in the Rules are without any checks and balances and confer an arbitrary and wide discretion on the authorities which can be misused and abused. That apart, the Rules suffer from total unreasonableness, arbitrariness and do not create a discernible specification between the political activities and other social or public activities. It has been

highlighted that the Rule nowhere defines what it is meant by political objective and that is why any action taken by a democratic institution in a democratic manner is likely to be covered within it and such an act clearly offends the right to protest and right to freedom of expression. It was contended that an organisation engaged in political actions which include “bandh,hartal or jail bharo” cannot be regarded as an organisation involved in political activities to be denied foreign contribution.

According to the provision of Section 5 of the Act, it is evincible that there is ample guidance inherent in it inasmuch as it refers to "activities of the organisation", or "the ideology propagated by the organisation" or the "programme of the organisation" having nexus with the activities of any political nature. The said terms are in large expanse but can never be regarded as vague or uncertain. The 2010 Act has been brought into existence to consolidate the law to regulate the acceptance and utilization of foreign contribution or foreign hospitality by certain individuals or associations or companies and to prohibit acceptance and utilization of foreign contribution or foreign hospitality for any activities detrimental to the national interest and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto. The law has been enacted by the Parliament to ensure that the parliamentary institutions, political association and academic and other voluntary organizations as well as individuals working in important areas of national life should function in a manner consistent with the values of Sovereign Democratic Republic of India. Article 19(1)(a) confers on all citizens the right of freedom of speech and expression. Article 19(2) enables the State to impose reasonable restrictions in the interest of sovereignty and integrity of India, security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, etc. Thus, an imposition of reasonable restriction is permissible. The provision under Section 5(1) carves out an exception when an organisation can be notified and thereafter barred from accepting foreign contribution Section 3(1)(f), Section 5(1) and Rule 3 have to be read together in harmony. The Rule effectuates the two sections and complements them. The Rule at every place refers to the political actions. Therefore, the Rule, according to the court, is within the rule making power of the statutory authority. It confirms to the provisions of the statute and comes within the scope of purview of the rule making power of the authority of framing the Rule. Therefore, the Rules cannot be declared as ultra vires the Act.

Heard Mr. Sanjay Parikh, learned counsel for the petitioner on the question of admission. Order reserved.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA	11aug2011	1
WRITTEN STATEMENT Filed by AAGNEY SAIL		17aug2011	2
		16sep2011	3

5. Centre For Promotion Of Social Concerns (CPSC) Vs. Union of India [W.P (C) 1594/2014]

For MISCELLANEOUS	CM APPL.3318/2014 CM APPL.3317/2014	07mar2014
<p>CM Appl. 3318/2014 in W.P.(C) 1594/2014 Allowed, subject to just exceptions. W.P.(C) 1594/2014 and CM Appl. 3317/2014</p> <p>Mr. Sanjay Parikh, learned counsel for petitioner submits that no action under Section 13 of the Act, 2010, is permissible unless and until action has been initiated under Section 14 of the Act, 2010. Issue notice. Mr. Ruchir Mishra , learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent. He prays for and is granted four weeks to file a counter affidavit. Rejoinder affidavit, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.</p>	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN	12mar2014
For MISCELLANEOUS Filed By BUSHRA PARVEEN Vide Diary No : 80938/2014	CM APPL.6119/2014	07may2014
<p>Mr. Sanjay Parikh has handed over a missing page in the present application. The same is taken on record. In the meantime, if no fresh suspension order has been passed under Section 3 of the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 2010, i.e., after 16th September, 2013, the petitioner shall be at liberty to operate its bank account no. 001801000020368 with Indian Overseas Bank, Chokkikulam Branch, Madurai.</p>	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN	09may2014

Though none is present for the respondent, yet it is permitted to file a counter affidavit within a further period of four weeks.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN	09jul2014
For MISCELLANEOUS Filed By MAMTA SAXENA Vide Diary No : 108089/2014	CM APPL.8629/2014	11jul2014
allow the applicant to fully operate the aforesaid account in terms of order dated 09.05.2014 in letter and spirit.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESH KAIT	16jul2014
Certified Copy of ORDER Applied By MAMTA Vide Diary No : 12864/2014		17jul2014
REPLY Filed by RUCHIR MISHRA Vide Diary No : 154461/2014 9		30aug2014
List on 28.01.2015.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU	02sep2014
REJOINDER Filed by MAMTA SAXENA Vide Diary No : 36656/2015		27jan2015
Learned counsel for the petitioner says that a rejoinder has been filed. The rejoinder is not on record. Counsel will take steps to bring the same on record.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER	28jan2015
Mr. Mishra affirms that no suspension orders have been passed. Therefore, it appears that the application has worked itself out as, even according to the respondents, the petitioners are operating the said bank account. The application is disposed of.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER	28apr2015

<p>CM No.3317/201 4</p> <p>This is an application seeking directions qua the respondents for release of funds and permission to the petitioner to utilise the funds available in the FCRA bank account during the pendency of the writ petition. It appears that this application has al so worked itself out. Accordingly, the application is disposed of. W.P.(C) 1594/2014 There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Pleadings are, however, complete in the matter. Adverse orders are deferred.</p>		
<p>No time left</p>	<p>HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW</p>	<p>13oct2015</p>
<p>None is present for the petitioner. Learned counsel for the respondent states that the present writ petition has become infructuous as the validity of the suspension of the registration orders has lapsed. In view thereof, the present writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.</p>	<p>HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN</p>	<p>02feb2016</p>

6. Indian Social Action Forum (INSAF) Vs. Union of India [W.P.(C)-10198/2016]

<p>No time left. CM APPL.-40315/2016 For MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA</p>	<p>26-oct-2016</p>
<p>W.P.(C) 10198/2016 & CM No.40315/2016(interim direction) Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had sought a decision on the application for renewal by the petitioner. He submits that the application of the petitioner has been refused and the present petition has become infructuous. The petitioner has already filed a petition, i.e. W.P.(C) No.10199/2016 impugning the decision of the respondent in refusing the grant of renewal. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of as infructuous without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties in W.P.(C) No.10199/2016.</p>	<p>HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA</p>	<p>27-oct-2016</p>

7. Indian Social Action Forum (INSAF) Vs. Union of India [W.P.(C)-10199/2016] pending

No time left. CM APPL. -40314/2016 For MISCELLANEOUS	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA	26-oct-2016
W.P.(C) 10199/2016 & CM No.40314/2016(interim direction) Issue notice. Notice is accepted by the learned counsel for the respondent. Let counter-affidavit be filed within a period of two weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within one week thereafter. It is directed that till the next date of hearing, the registration of the petitioner shall be deemed to continue for the purposes of withdrawal of money from the FCRA Account for utilization in accordance with the Act. However, the petitioner would not be entitled to receive any fresh contribution in foreign exchange till the next date of hearing.	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA	27-oct-2016
Judge on leave	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA	30-nov-2016
AFFIDAVIT Filed by VIDUR MOHAN Vide Diary No : 341045/2016		23-dec-2016
At joint request, renotify on 21.04.2017	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA	24-jan-2017
CM APPL. Filed By RAHUL JAIN On Behalf of respondent INDIAN SOCIAL ACTION FORUM Vide Diary No : 155808/2017		29-mar-2017
		21-apr-2017

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Afeef Saadulla	5 yr, Institute of Law, Nirma University
Amit Kumar Kashyap	Assistant Professor, Institute of Law, Nirma University
Anchit Bhandari	5th yr, Institute of Law, Nirma University
Fahad Mohammad Khan	Centre for Social Justice
Kirti Singh	4th yr, Institute of Law, Nirma University
Nadim Khan	Assistant Professor, Institute of Law, Nirma University
Nupur	Centre for Social Justice
Sumit Kumar Ganguly	Centre for Social Justice
Titus James	Centre for Social Justice
Naveen Kumar Gautam	Centre for Social Justice
Abhishek Srivastava	Centre for Social Justice
Tanay Gandhi	Centre for Social Justice
Rushali Srivastava	4th yr, Institute of Law, Nirma University
Toshit Godara	2nd yr , Institute of Law , Nirma University
Urvashi Jaswani	5th yr, Institute of Law, Nirma University
Yashowardhan Snv Dixit	4th yr, Institute of Law, Nirma University