



\$~111

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3379/2026**

**CONCEPT MEDICAL RESEARCH PVT. LTD.
& ANR.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Senu Nizar, Advocate.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF ELECTRONICS AND
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Jagdish chandra CGSC Ms
Ashiwriya Sinha Ms Maanya Saxena
Mr Sujeet Chaudhary, Advocates for
R-1 and 2.

Ms. Ameer Rana, Ms. Sana Banyal,
Ms. Komal Pathak, Ms. Bhavnish
Kaur, Advocates for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

17.03.2026

1. The petitioner is a Company based in the State of Gujarat. The sole reason to approach this Court is the situs of the respondent-Authority against whom grievance is raised.
2. The essential dispute lies outside the territorial jurisdiction of this Court. There may have been a part of cause of action which can be said to have arisen in Delhi, however, the material, integral and essential cause of action has arisen outside the jurisdiction of this Court. The inaction/action



on the part of the respondents will have to be felt in the State of Gujarat.

3. This Court in the case of ***The Indure Pvt. Ltd. v. Government of NCT of Delhi***,² has held that the situs of the respondent will not be the sole reason to determine the territorial jurisdiction of the Court to entertain a writ petition. The paragraph no. 36 of the said decision is extracted as under:

“36. A petitioner who approaches this Court to assail a decision of an authority situated in Delhi, when the underlying cause for the said decision lies elsewhere, effectively attempts to make this High Court a mini-pan-India Superior Court exercising jurisdiction over all events which take place throughout this Country. There is no gainsaying with the proposition that every High Court is competent to adjudicate upon a lis which arises from events or actions taking place within its territory. Merely because the ultimate order, which is based on events taking place outside Delhi and takes cognizance of actions outside of Delhi, is passed within the jurisdiction of this Court, a writ petition ought not be entertained by this Court.”

4. In the case of ***Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Union of India and Anr.***,³ in paragraph no. 30, 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. In view thereof, the Court finds that the petitioner will have to approach the jurisdictional High Court where the material, integral and

² 2026:DHC:1605.



essential cause of action has arisen.

6. With the aforesaid liberty, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 17, 2026

aks

³ (2004) 6 SCC 254.