



\$~63

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ W.P.(C) 9122/2025

PAWAN BHIMSARIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Suryansh Kumar Arora, Mr
Samresh Chandra Jha, Mr Avinash
Kumar Bharti, Advocates.

versus

CPIO UNION BANK OF INDIA KOLKATA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. OP Gaggar and Mr. Sachindra
Karn, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

23.04.2026

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

“a. Set Aside the Impugned order dated 27.05.2025 passed by the Central Information Commission in Second Appeal No CIC/UBIND/N2024/ 116560 and/ or;

b. Direct the Respondent CPIO to provide and furnish the information sought by the Petitioner by way of his Application under the RTI Act, 2005.

c. Pass any such orders, or directions which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in the interest of justice.”

2. With respect to almost similar controversy as involved herein, this Court in the case of petitioner himself titled as **Pawan Bhimsaria vs. CPIO Union Bank of India Mumbai**¹ has held that merely the Central Information Commission (‘CIC’) is in Delhi, should not be the sole reason to entertain



the petition by this Court.

3. In the instant case, the Central Public Information Office (*'CPIO'*) is at Kolkata, therefore, the petitioner will have to approach the jurisdictional High Court.

4. In *Siddhartha S. Mookerjee and Anr. v. Madhab Chand Mitter and Anr.*², the Supreme Court was moved to assail an order of this Court, whereby notice was issued in a petition, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution, challenging an order passed by the National Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission at New Delhi (*'NCDRC'*). The facts in that case were, that originally, a complaint was filed before the District Consumer Dispute Redressal Forum at Kolkata, which was rejected vide order dated 13.10.2017. Aggrieved by the same, an appeal was filed before the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, West Bengal at Kolkata which was allowed vide order dated 13.02.2020. Dissatisfied by the said order, review petitions were preferred before the NCDRC, which were in turn allowed.

5. On the sole ground that the NCDRC, which is the authority that passed the impugned order, is situated in Delhi, the jurisdiction of this Court was invoked, and notice in the said petition was issued. While allowing the appeal, and disposing of the writ petitions filed before this Court, the Supreme Court noted that that cannot be a ground to move the Delhi High Court. The material portion of the judgement reads as under:

“8. Learned counsel for the respondent no. 1 contends that the jurisdictional High Court in the instant case ought to be treated as the High Court of Delhi, inasmuch as the judgment impugned before the High Court was passed by the NCDRC at Delhi.

¹ W.P.(C) 10357/2025; dated 12.03.2026

² 2024 SCC OnLine SC 4285



9. In our opinion, that can hardly be treated as a ground to invoke the jurisdiction of the High Court of Delhi. The respondent No. 1 ought to have approached the High Court of Calcutta being aggrieved by the impugned judgment as the entire cause of action in the present case has arisen in Kolkata, where the patient was operated for ovarian cancer on 24th February, 2012, and expired on 30th July, 2014. The complaint case was filed at Kolkata based on the aforesaid cause of action. Merely, because the NCDRC has allowed the revision petitions filed by the appellants and the respondent no. 2 would not be a ground to vest jurisdiction in the High Court of Delhi.

10. Accordingly, the appeals are allowed. The petitions filed before the High Court of Delhi are disposed of with liberty granted to the respondent no. 1 to approach the High Court of Calcutta for seeking appropriate relief. In the event the respondent no. 1 files a petition before the High Court of Calcutta within four weeks from today, the appellant herein shall not raise any objection as to the maintainability of the said petition on the ground of limitation. It is further directed that in this duration, the appellants shall not rely on the order passed by the NCDRC.”

6. The principle of **Siddhartha S. Mookerjee and Anr.**, (supra) applies with full force to the facts of the instant case. The material, essential and integral cause of action has arisen outside the territorial jurisdiction of this Court. Even if it is considered that a part of cause of action may have arisen in Delhi, however, the same should not be the sole reason to entertain the instant petition.

7. In view of the above, the petition stands dismissed. Liberty is, however, granted in favour of the petitioner to approach the jurisdictional High Court to agitate the instant *lis*, if so advised.

8. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 23, 2026

Nc