



\$~64

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 7050/2026 & CM APPL. 34562/2026**

VIKRAMNATH SURYANARAYAN PANDEY & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Bhavnish Wadhwa, Mr.
Amanpreet Singh Pannu, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH SECRETARY & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Iram Majid, CGSC with Mohd
Suboor, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **20.05.2026**

1. The present petition has been filed seeking to quash the communications dated 27.04.2026 and 28.04.2026 (*'the impugned communications'*), whereby the visa conversion application of petitioner no.2 and petitioner no.3 had been closed without assigning any reasons.
2. A perusal of the facts would indicate that the essential cause of action pertaining to the case at hand had arisen outside the jurisdiction of this Court.
3. The application for visa conversion/ extension application was submitted by the petitioners before respondent no.2/Foreigners Regional Registration Officer at Bengaluru (*hereinafter referred to as 'FRRO Bengaluru'*). The said application was rejected by FRRO Bengaluru *vide* the impugned communications, and the petitioners were directed to exit the country. It is also not disputed that the petitioners at the relevant time were



residing at Bengaluru.

4. Nothing in relation to the cause of action in the present petition had taken place in Delhi. The bare facts leading to the grievance raised by the petitioners seem to have arisen outside the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.

5. The mere fact that respondent no.1 is in Delhi would not be the sole determinative factor, to invoke the territorial jurisdiction of this Court. The Supreme Court in the case of ***Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Union of India and Anr***¹ has held that a small part of the cause of action arising within the territorial jurisdiction of a High Court may not be a determinative factor that compels the High Court to decide the matter on merit. The relevant portion of the Judgement is extracted below for clarity:-

“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] .]”

6. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of.

7. Liberty is, however, granted to the petitioners to approach the jurisdictional High Court.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

MAY 20, 2026/P

¹ (2004) 6 SCC 254