

\$~28

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

+ W.P.(C) 4368/2017 & CM.No.19109-10/2017

MOHAMMAD SANAULLAH

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms.Meenakshi Rawat, Mr.Rajash Chhetri
and Mr.Rajeev Chhetri, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Shiva Lakshmi CGSC, Mr.Ruchir
Ranjan Rai, Adv. with Mr. S.S.Sejwal,
Law Officer, CRPF.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.HARI SHANKAR

ORDER

% **19.05.2017**

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that there is an error in prayer clause which refers to impugned order dated 31.10.2016 and gives an impression that the same was passed in New Delhi. It is stated that the impugned order was passed in Srinagar.

After some hearing learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present writ petition may be treated as representation to the respondents with a prayer for supply of a copy of charge-sheet, enquiry report and other documents mentioned and relied.

Learned counsel for the respondents has objected to the territorial jurisdiction and also relies upon the doctrine of Forum Conveniens. However, the respondents have stated that they would examine the representation of the

petitioner in accordance with law and inform him within six weeks.

We clarify that we have not commented on merits or the question of territorial jurisdiction/Forum Conveniens. Petitioner if aggrieved, will be entitled to file a fresh petition before the appropriate forum in accordance with law.

Recording the said, the writ petition is disposed of as not pressed. Pending applications are also disposed of.

SANJIV KHANNA, J

C.HARI SHANKAR, J

MAY 19, 2017

mr