



\$~70

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2237/2025**

SH BASUKI NATH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jitender Mehta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Viplav Acharya, Senior Panel
Counsel with Ms. Laavanya Kaushik, Government
Pleader for Respondent No.1/UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

% **24.02.2025**

CM APPL. 10453-10454/2025

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 2237/2025 and CM APPL. 10452/2025

3. This writ petition is preferred on behalf of the Petitioner, *inter alia*, laying a challenge to Clause 11 of Commercial Circular No.20 of 2017 "Catering Policy 2017" dated 27.02.2017 issued by Respondent No.3 as also for a direction to extend the license of the Petitioner for a period of 07 months at par with the Petitioners who were granted benefit of extension in other writ petitions by this Court.
4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that benefit of extension of the license period for 07 months has been granted by this Court in other writ



petitions and Petitioner is entitled to a similar relief. On point of territorial jurisdiction of this Court to entertain the writ petition, it is submitted that the Circular in challenge is issued by the Railway Board from Delhi and thus this Court has the territorial jurisdiction to entertain the writ petition.

5. On a pointed query to the learned counsel for the Petitioner whether the Petitioner seeks the same relief as granted in other writ petitions wherein challenge was given up to the impugned Circular, it is urged that Petitioner does not press his challenge to the Circular.

6. Once the challenge to the impugned Circular dated 27.11.2024 is given up, this Court will have no territorial jurisdiction to entertain the present writ petition as neither the stall of the Petitioner is located in Delhi nor Respondent No.2, the authority which has to extend the license is in Delhi.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for the Petitioner, on instructions, seeks to withdraw the writ petition to approach the appropriate Court having jurisdiction in the matter.

8. Writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn, with liberty as prayed for in accordance with law making it clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Pending application stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 24, 2025

B.S. Rohella