



\$~12 to 14

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

+ W.P.(C) 1747/2026 and CM APPL. 8531/2026, CM APPL. 8532/2026

COL ANIL KHAJURIA RETDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Apoorv Kurup, Sr. Adv with Mr. Karn Deo Baghel, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr Govil Upadhyaya, GP for UOI.

13

+ W.P.(C) 1748/2026 and CM APPL. 8533/2026, CM APPL. 8534/2026

COL RAGHURAJ SINGH RETDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Apoorv Kurup, Sr. Adv with Mr. Karn Deo Baghel, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Swati R. K., CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, GP for UOI.

14

+ W.P.(C) 1749/2026 and CM APPL. 8535/2026, CM APPL. 8536/2026

COL LALIT YADAV RETDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Apoorv Kurup, Sr. Adv with Mr.



Karn Deo Baghel, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Brijesh Kumar Tamber, Cvinay
singh bist adv ms arani Mukherjee
adv

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **07.02.2026**

1. These petitions assail dis-empanelment orders passed by the Directorate of Resettlement Zone (West) (**hereinafter 'DRZ'**), Government of India against the petitioners.
2. The facts would indicate that the petitioners were empanelled as proprietors of the Director General of Resettlement (**hereinafter 'DGR'**) Security Agency. Subsequently, the Food Corporation of India, Jaipur engaged the petitioners to provide security services from 01.02.2025 to 31.01.2027.
3. Thereafter, the DRZ, Zone West, Chandimandir, Chandigarh issued show cause notices in respect of allegations that some of the guards employed by the petitioners were found with forged ex-servicemen document. Being dissatisfied with the petitioners' reply to the same, the DRZ issued the impugned dis-empanelment orders.
4. It is the case of the petitioners that impugned orders have been issued without the approval of DGR and without affording any opportunity of



hearing to the petitioners. The impugned orders also direct the Food Corporation of India, Jaipur to terminate their contracts.

5. It is, thus, seen that the impugned orders have been issued from Chandigarh, and their effect is being felt in Jaipur. The only reason to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court, is presumably on the ground that the appeal is pending before the DGR – which is the Authority, who empanelled the petitioners, is situated within the jurisdiction of this Court.

6. Additionally, it is also contended that the policy of the DGR, has not been adhered to by the respondent-Authority at Chandigarh.

7. The Court is, however, of the opinion that the cause of action arose not out of the empanelment of the petitioners by the DGR, but out of their dis-empanelment by the DRZ, Chandimandir, Chandigarh. The effect of the orders is in Jaipur, where the petitioners were employed.

8. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the Court finds that by virtue of one of the respondents being within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court and pendency of the appeal, a part of cause of action may have arisen, however, the same should not be the sole determinative factor to entertain the writ petitions when the material, integral and substantial cause of action has arisen outside the jurisdiction of this Court. 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 arise 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

¹ (2004) 6 SCC 254.



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] .]”

9. Accordingly, the instant petitions, along with pending applications, stand dismissed.

10. However, having considered the wider ramifications that may arise out of the impugned orders, the Court deems it appropriate to protect the rights and interest of the petitioners for a period of seven (7) days from today.

11. The petitioners undertake that they will not claim any equity on the basis of the aforesaid arrangement. Accordingly, the *status quo*, as of today, with respect to the petitioners’ status shall be maintained for a period of seven (7) days.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 7, 2026

aks/amg