



\$~14

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

+ W.P.(C) 12342/2025 & CM APPL. 59494/2025

CHEMI RIGZIN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Giriraj Subramaniam, Mr.  
Simarpal Singh Sawhney, Mr. Jaisal  
Baath and Ms. Reaa Mehta, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nidhi Raman, CGSC with Mr.  
Arnav Mittal and Mr. Akash Mishra,  
Advs. for UoI.  
Mr. Rishi Kant Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Debarshi Bhadra, Adv.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

% **20.01.2026**

1. The petitioner is from Dehradun. The regional transport officer, who rejected the petitioner's application is also situated in Dehradun. Merely on the basis of the Head Office of the respondents being situated within Delhi, this Court's jurisdiction is being invoked.

2. In *Smt. Manjira Devi Ayurveda Medical College and Hospital v. Uttarakhand University of Ayurveda and Ors.*,<sup>2</sup> the Division Bench of this Court, declared that the mere presence of the office of a respondent being within the jurisdiction of this Court would not cloth the Court with the jurisdiction to entertain the *lis*. The material portion of the judgement reads

---

<sup>2</sup> 2024:DHC:6903-DB



as under:

*“12. It is not disputed that the appellant is located in Uttarakhand. It is also not disputed that the respondent no.1/University, to which the appellant is affiliated, is also located in Uttarakhand. Undeniably, the representations by the appellant have been submitted not only to the Registrar of the Uttarakhand Ayurveda University at Dehradun but also to the Secretary, Ayush and Ayush Education, Uttarakhand Secretariat which itself is located in Dehradun in the State of Uttarakhand. Admittedly, no representation at all on the issue raised in the underlying writ petition has ever been submitted to any of the respondent nos. 2 to 4 who are located in Delhi. It is not the case of the appellant that any such representation was indeed made over to respondent nos. 2 to 4 or that the same were either rejected or not responded to. The mere presence by virtue of the location of their offices at Delhi would not, ipso facto, confer exclusive jurisdiction upon this Court to exercise its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. It is apparent that no cause of action at all has arisen within the local limits of the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.”*

3. Relying upon the observations in **Smt. Majira Devi Ayurveda Medical College** (supra), the co-ordinate bench of this Court in **Michael Builders and Developers Pvt. Ltd.**<sup>3</sup> importantly, declared as under:

*“13. It was argued primarily on behalf of the petitioner that since the National Medical Commission has its head office in Delhi, this Court should exercise jurisdiction. However, the mere situation of the head office of National Medical Commission or Indian Nursing Council in Delhi does not automatically confer jurisdiction upon this Court. These bodies have offices, and their legal teams, which function in every State across the country, including Tamil Nadu. Thus, the argument that National Medical Commission or Indian Nursing Council is based in Delhi is insufficient to justify the filing of a writ petition before this Court, especially when the cause of action has arisen, and the parties involved herein are located, in Tamil Nadu and have already approached the Courts situated in the State of Tamil Nadu and have contested and obtained orders from the said Courts.”*

4. More, importantly, even if the situs of the head office is considered as

---

<sup>3</sup> 2024:DHC:7146.



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.***,<sup>4</sup> 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 India [(1994) 1 CHN 445] and New Horizons Ltd. v. Union of India [AIR 1994 Del 126] .]”*

5. Thus, in light of the facts and circumstances of the instant case, and the law discussed above, the present petition is dismissed for want of jurisdiction. The petitioner is at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law, before a Court of competent jurisdiction. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J**  
**JANUARY 20, 2026/P/KSR**

---

<sup>4</sup> (2004) 6 SCC 254.