



2026:DHC:4100



\$~91

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6224/2026 and CM APPL. 30500/2026**

Date of decision: **07.05.2026.****IN THE MATTER OF:-**

M/S BLOOM JINDAL JV IN ASSOCIATION WITH KAPIL MUNI
INFRA PROJECT PVT LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Vivek Bhadauria, Ms.Pooja
Singh, Mr.Bankim K. Kulshrestha,
Mr.Vijender Singh Nirmal,
Advocates.

versus

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T**PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)****CM APPL. 30499 and 30501/2026 (for exemption)**

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 6224/2026 and CM APPL. 30500/2026

1. The instant petition is for the following reliefs:-

Signature Not Verified
Signed By: NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date: 08.05.2026
19:16:42

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By: PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:4100



“(a) Issue any appropriate Writ(s), Order, Direction to the respondent, directing them, to withdraw/ set-aside the impugned Termination letter dt- 20/04/2026, issued against petitioner, BY RESPONDENT, on the ground of non compliance of order dt-21/05/2025 passed by this Hon'ble court, as same is not relevant/ required in the present PROJECT.

(b) Pass any such further order(s), Direction(s), which this Hon'ble Court may deem just fit and proper under the facts & circumstances of the case submitted hereinabove, in the interest of justice.”

2. The facts of the case would indicate that the petitioner and the respondent entered into an agreement dated 27.08.2021 for consultancy services for construction of High Altitude Hill road from Tedadege TO Henkaer from KM 0.000 to KM 28.550 in West Siang District of the State of Arunachal Pradesh on EPC Mode and construction of High Altitude Hill road from Doginala TO Gau from KM 0.000 to KM 15.320 in Upper Subansiri District of the State of Arunachal Pradesh on EPC Mode through INFRA CON and CPP portal.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner may be correct in stating that a part of cause of action has arisen in Delhi. However, the Supreme Court in the case of ***Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Union of India and Anr.***,¹ has held 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*. The material portion of the aforementioned decision reads 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] .]”

4. This Court in ***The Indure Pvt. Ltd. v. Government of NCT of Delhi***,² took note of the decisions in ***Shristi Udaipur Hotels v. Housing and Urban Development Corp.***,³ ***Riddhima Singh v. Central Board of Secondary Education***,⁴ ***Smt. Manjira Devi Ayurveda Medical College and Hospital v. Uttarakhand University of Ayurveda and Ors.***,⁵ ***Michael Builders and Developers Pvt. Ltd. v. National Medical Commission and Ors.***,⁶ which declare that the situs of the head office/registered office of the respondent, does not determine whether the Court has the requisite territorial jurisdiction to entertain a writ petition.

5. The Court in ***The Indure Pvt. Ltd.*** importantly noted, at para. 36:

“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

² 2026:DHC:1605.

³ 2014 SCC OnLine Del 2892.

⁴ 2023 SCC OnLine Del 7168.

⁵ 2024:DHC:6903-DB

⁶ 2024:DHC:7146.



2026:DHC:4100



jurisdiction of this Court, a writ petition ought not be entertained by this Court.”

6. In the facts of the instant case, the work itself is performed outside the jurisdiction of this Court. What has taken place in Delhi, is ancillary action. The entire genesis of the dispute lies in the said agreement. The Court thus, finds that merely because the respondent has passed the order from Delhi, should not be the sole reason to entertain the instant writ petition.
7. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands dismissed along with all pending applications.
8. Liberty is, however, granted to the petitioner to approach the jurisdictional High Court.
9. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

MAY 7, 2026/Nc

Signature Not Verified
Signed By: NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date: 08.05.2026
19:16:42

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By: PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV