



\$~29

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1265/2026**

MITHELESH CHOUDHARY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. K. K. Sharma, Mr. Harshit
Agarwal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shekhar Kumar, SPC and Mr
Ankush Kapoor GP

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

30.01.2026

CM APPL. 6271/2026 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.,

W.P.(C) 1265/2026

3. This petition has been filed with the following prayers:

“In view of the above-said facts and circumstances, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may most graciously be pleased to pass in favour of the present petitioner and against the respondents:

a) Issue a writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, quashing and setting aside the impugned order dated 10/10/2024 passed by Respondent No.5, whereby the Petitioner was removed from service;

b) Issue a writ of certiorari/mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, quashing and setting aside the impugned



appellate order dated 26/03/2025 passed by Respondent No.4, where the order of the Respondent No. 5 was upheld and appeal was dismissed;

c) Issue a writ of certiorari/ mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, quashing and setting aside the impugned revisional order dated 29/09/2025 passed by Respondent No.3, where the order of the Respondent No.4 & 5 was upheld and Revision was dismissed;

d) Issue a writ of certiorari/mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, directing the Respondents to reinstate the Petitioner in service forthwith all consequential benefits arising out of therefrom;...”

4. A preliminary objection has been taken by the counsel for respondents, that this Court does not have the territorial jurisdiction to entertain the petition as all the proceedings which are impugned before this Court have been held in Dehradun, not under the territorial jurisdiction of this Court, even otherwise, the petitioner is a resident of Bihar.

5. On this submission, the learned counsel for the petitioner by relying upon Rule 30 of the Central Reserve Police Force Rules, 1955 contend that the said rule contemplates that a representation can be made to the Director General (DG) of the force, and the DG is within the Territorial Jurisdiction of this Court and, therefore, the petition is maintainable.

6. We are unable to agree with the said submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner for the simple reason that Rule 30 of which reference is made, is not a statutory provision for making a representation before the DG, in relation to departmental proceedings. The petitioner having exhausted the statutory remedies in respect of departmental proceedings outside the Territorial Jurisdiction of this Court, this Court cannot entertain a petition challenging those orders.



7. Appropriate for the petitioner is to approach the Court of competent jurisdiction in accordance with law.
8. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed, with liberty as above.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

JANUARY 30, 2026

tg