



\$~64

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4892/2025 & CM APPL. 22515/2025**

BHILAI ENGINEERING CORPORATION LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishi Anand, Mr. Utkarsh Mishra
and Ms. Deeksha Dubey, Advs.

versus

STEEL AUTHORITY OF INDIA LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **19.01.2026**

1. The *lis* in the present writ petition emanates from the Impugned Blacklisting order dated 19.03.2025, whereby the respondent has banned the petitioner from all future business dealings with all its Plants, Units and Subsidiaries until 11.09.2026. The underlying project pertains to the installation of Sinter Plant-II at the Bokaro Steel Plant in the State of Jharkhand. The petitioner itself is situated in Chhattisgarh.

2. Further, it is a matter of record that the petitioner had earlier approached the Jharkhand High Court with respect to another Blacklisting Order dated 12.09.2024, in W.P.(C) No. 2503 of 2023 titled ***Bhilai Engineering Corporation Limited v. Steel Authority of India Limited***, which arose from the same project. The Jharkhand High Court granted an



interim relief in favour of the petitioner herein and against the respondent-Authority, stating that no risk and cost shall be recovered from the petitioner with respect to the same project at Bokaro Steel Plant. However, later, the said petition was withdrawn upon the respondent passing the subsequent order.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is correct in contending that a part of the cause of action has arisen within the jurisdiction of this Court, to the effect that the impugned order has been passed by the respondent- Authority, which has its registered office in Delhi. However, the same should not be the sole reason to entertain the petition by this Court.

4. Even if the mere situs of the head office is considered as a part of the bundle of facts constituting the cause of action, the mere fact that a small part of the cause of action arises within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court would not by itself be a determinative factor compelling the Court to assume jurisdiction. The writ remedy, being inherently a discretionary remedy, the High Court, may refuse to entertain a petition, in appropriate cases. Reliance may be placed on ***Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Union of India and Anr.***,¹ the material portion of which reads 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

¹ (2004) 6 SCC 254.



India [(1994) 1 CHN 445] and New Horizons Ltd. v. Union of India [AIR 1994 Del 126] .]”

5. There is no reason as to why the petitioner should be allowed to file a petition pertaining to the same contract in different High Courts. In view thereof, the Court finds that there is no justification to entertain the instant petition and instead, the petitioner is granted liberty to approach the jurisdictional High Court.

6. Petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

JANUARY 19, 2026

P/MJ