



\$~57

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

+ W.P.(C) 3991/2026

MANOJ KUMAR GOND

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay
Lalan, Mr. Alok Raj, Mr.
Akhand Shresth Pandey and
Mr. Venugopal Abhay, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH THE SECRETARY HOME
DEPARTMENT & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh
Rudy, CGSC along with Ms.
Usha Jamnal, Ms. Nyasa
Sharma and Mr. Ankit Khatri,
Advs. with Mr. Ajay Pal, Law
Officer, Insp. Athurv and Mr.
Ramniwas Yadav – CRPF.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

18.05.2026

%

1. The instant Writ Petition has been filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeking setting aside of the dismissal order dated 10.12.2007 passed by the Commandant, 40th Battalion, CRPF, the appellate order dated 14.10.2008 passed by the Deputy Inspector General of Police, G.C.-1, Ajmer, Rajasthan, and the revision order dated 16.12.2010 passed by the Inspector General of Police, R. K. Puram, New Delhi, along with reinstatement with consequential benefits.

2. Before proceeding to the merits, this Court has examined the question of territorial jurisdiction, as it is a threshold issue that must



be resolved at the inception of proceedings itself.

3. The Petitioner was recruited and enlisted at Muzaffarpur, Bihar. He was subsequently posted to Halflong in Assam, then to Varanasi, and finally to the 40th Battalion at Anantnag, Jammu and Kashmir. The entire factual substratum of this matter, including the recruitment, the alleged forgery, the departmental enquiry, and the original order of dismissal, all arose outside the territorial jurisdiction of this Court. The appellate order was passed at Ajmer, Rajasthan. No part of the real and substantive cause of action can be said to have arisen within the Union Territory of Delhi so as to confer jurisdiction on this Court under Article 226(2) of the Constitution.

4. The Petitioner has not placed any material before this Court to establish that any part of the cause of action arose within this Court's territorial limits. In the absence of such foundation, this Court cannot entertain the present petition.

5. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed for want of territorial jurisdiction. This dismissal is confined to the question of jurisdiction alone and carries no opinion on the merits.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

MAY 18, 2026

sp /kb