

\$~6

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 2565/2016

BHAGIRATH & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Bijan Ghosh, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Dev Bhardwaj, Advocate for R-1.
Mr. Ankur S. Kulkarni, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

%

09.03.2017

1. This writ petition is filed by 194 petitioners who are employees of the respondent no. 2/Central Silk Board. All the petitioners are situated at different addresses which are not in Delhi and respondent no. 2 is also situated at Bangalore and not at Delhi with the further fact that the impugned circulars have been issued by the respondent no. 2 at Bangalore and not at Delhi.

2. Since this Court does not have territorial jurisdiction and petitioners have *bonafidely* filed this petition in this Court, accordingly, as prayed, this writ petition is allowed to be withdrawn with liberty to the petitioners to file appropriate independent proceedings in the competent court of territorial jurisdiction. Of

course, petitioners in accordance with law will be entitled to the benefit of the principle contained in Section 14 of the Limitation Act, 1963 with respect to appropriate independent proceedings which will be filed in the competent court.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

MARCH 09, 2017

AK