

\$~37

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2201/2018**

**BHUPINDER SINGH ANAND** ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajnish Ranjan, Adv.

versus

**GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.** ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shobhana Takiar, Adv. for  
GNCTD.

Mr. Rajeev Virmani, Sr. Adv with  
Mr. Sunil Sethi, Mr. Rohit Chandra,  
Mr. Dhruba Dhar and Mr. Rishabh  
Bhargav, Advs for R-4.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER**

**ORDER**

% **29.05.2018**

**C.M. Appl. No. 23106-07/2018**

1 These are applications filed by respondent No.4 to seek recall of the order dated 09.03.2018. The order passed on 09.03.2018 reads as under:

*“2. The substantive prayer made in the writ petition is as follows:*

*“Pass a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ/order directing respondents no.1 to 3 to initiate proceedings against respondent no.4 for the violation of the provisions of the Act in terms of Sections 26 & 27 of the Act.”*

*3. It is not disputed before me by learned counsel for the petitioner that a representation was made by respondent nos.1 to 3, which is dated 6.2.2018. I am informed by the counsel for petitioner that the said representation has not been disposed of.*

*4. In these circumstances, respondents no.1 to 3 is directed to*

*dispose of the representation. Let the needful be done as expeditiously as possible, though, not later than ten (10) weeks from today.*

*5. Writ petition is disposed of in the aforementioned terms.”*

2. As would be evident, all that the Court had directed was that respondents’ No. 1 to 3, as prayed, would dispose of the representation of the petitioner.

3. Mr. Virmani, learned senior counsel, who, appears in support of the captioned applications for respondent No.4, says that respondents No. 1 to 3 have no territorial jurisdiction. An alternative prayer in that behalf has also been made in the applications.

4. According to me, the applications can be disposed of with a direction to respondents No. 1 to 3 that, before proceeding further in the matter, they would hear the applicant/respondent No.4 with regard to whether or not they have territorial jurisdiction to deal with the matter.

4.1 In case respondents No. 1 to 3 come to a conclusion that they have jurisdiction in the matter, they will give opportunity to all those concerned in the matter to have their say with regard to the merits of the case. Needless to say, the aforesaid exercise will be carried out by respondents No. 1 to 3 with due expedition.

5. In these circumstances, the applications are disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

**RAJIV SHAKDHER, J**

**MAY 29, 2018**

**A**