



\$~97

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

+ W.P.(C) 1393/2026, CM APPL. 6856/2026, CM APPL. 6857/2026 &
CM APPL. 6858/2026

APM INDUSTRIES LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Kumar, Advocate; Mr.
Arvind Rudhra, Advocate; Mr.
Saurabh Panwar, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL GROUND WATER AUTHORITY & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar (SPC) ,Mr.
Sarbhak Rana(G.P)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

02.02.2026

1. The petition is for directions to the Central Ground Water Authority (respondent no. 1) to issue a 'No-Objection Certificates' (NOC) for the periods between 08.12.2023 to 07.12.2025 and 08.12.2025 to 07.12.2027 with a sanctioned limit of 325 KLD.
2. The petitioner runs a textile spinning unit at Bhiwadi, Rajasthan and had filed an application before respondent no. 1, seeking permission for groundwater abstraction for the said unit, as per the 'Guidelines to regulate and control ground water extraction in India, 2020' framed under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
3. The sole reason for approaching this Court seems to be that the



respondent authorities are located within the jurisdiction of this Court. However, considering that the relief sought is in respect of an industrial unit in the State of Rajasthan, the essential and integral part of the cause of action has arisen outside the jurisdiction of this Court.

4. The Supreme Court in the case of ***Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Union of India and Anr.***,¹ has examined the aspect of maintainability of petitions where the cause of action arises within the jurisdiction of different High Courts, and has held as under:

“*Forum conveniens*”

30. We must, however, remind ourselves that even if a small part of cause of action arises within the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court, the same by itself may not be considered to be a determinative factor compelling the High Court to decide the matter on merit. In appropriate cases, the Court may refuse to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction by invoking the doctrine of *forum conveniens*. [See *Bhagat Singh Bugga v. Dewan Jagbir Sawhney* [AIR 1941 Cal 670 : ILR (1941) 1 Cal 490] , *Madanlal Jalan v. Madanlal* [(1945) 49 CWN 357 : AIR 1949 Cal 495] , *Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. v. Jharia Talkies & Cold Storage (P) Ltd.* [1997 CWN 122] , *S.S. Jain & Co. v. Union of India* [(1994) 1 CHN 445] and *New Horizons Ltd. v. Union of India* [AIR 1994 Del 126] .]”

5. Keeping in view the principle laid down by the Supreme Court and invoking the principle of *forum conveniens*, the Court declined to entertain the instant petition. The petitioner shall be free to take appropriate remedy before the competent Court of jurisdiction.

6. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 2, 2026/P/AMG

¹ (2004) 6 SCC 254.