



\$~86

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

+ W.P.(C) 3670/2026

Date of Decision: **23.03.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

MOHANDAS VELUKUTTY

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Radhika Bishwajit Dubey, CGSC with Ms. Gurleen Kaur Waraich, Mr. Kritarth Upadhyay, Mr. Amulya Dev Mishra Advocates for R-1 to 5.
Mr Ajay Pal, Law Officer, Insp Athurv and Mr Ramniwas Yadav, CRPF.
Mr. Swastik Singh, Mr. Atul Singh, Mr. B.K Wadhwa, Ms. Nidhi Tyagi and Ms. Pratima Nasa, Advocates for R-6 to 11.
Mr Anshuman Amaresh for R-11.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner for the following reliefs:



“1. Issue an appropriate Writ of Prohibition, restraining Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (Ministry of Home Affairs, Delhi Police, and Ministry of Defence) from continuing any official affiliation, participation, or allowing the use of their institutional names, emblems, and authority by the Respondent private company (Karate India Organisation) or its office bearers (Respondent Nos. 6 to 11) during the pendency of existing criminal investigations and statutory inquiries.

2. Issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing Respondent No. 4 (Ministry of Corporate Affairs) to expeditiously complete the ordered inquiry and inspection into the affairs of the Respondent companys regarding the alleged misuse of its Section 8 (Non-Profit) license for commercial activities, benami transactions, and illegal wealth accumulation, and to take appropriate regulatory action, including the cancellation of its license if warranted by law.

3. Issue Writ of Mandamus, directing Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to ensure a fair, transparent, and loyal investigation into FIR No. 259/2025 and all other pending complaints regarding the fraudulent issuance of Central Government Sports Quota forms and the illegal deportation of minor players abroad, without being influenced by any prior unauthorized institutional patronage.

4. Issue an appropriate Writ of Prohibition or Order restraining Respondent Nos. 6 to 11 from the unauthorized and fraudulent use of the names, and images of high constitutional authorities, including the Hon'ble President of India and the Hon'ble Prime Minister of India, and other Government security agencies names, International Olympic Council and its recognized bodies names to create a false aura of official legitimacy or to evade criminal liability.”

2. The petitioner seems to have approached the Kerala High Court in W.

P. (C) 1344/2025 for the following reliefs:

“(i) Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other writ order or direction directing the respondents 1 to 5 and 6 to constitute National level body with due approval and recognition in order to represent the Karate sport representing the Nation in International programmes as well as other programmes.

(ii) Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other Writ order or directions directing the respondents 1 to 5 to consider and dispose of Ext. P16 representation within a stipulated time with due record to the provisions of the National Sports Development Code of India 2011 as well as Olympic Chapter.

iii. Issue a writ of prohibition or other writ order or direction prohibiting the respondents 7, 8 and 10 from functioning in any manner and conducting any programme 1 relating to the sport Karate including the



selection and participation of candidates being conducted abroad from collecting amounts without prior permission of respondents 5 and 6.

(iv) Dispense with the filing of English translation of vernacular documents.

(v) Issue such other relief which may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the above writ petition.”

3. The petitioner, who appears in person, has approached this Court presumably on the ground that the complaint is pending against the Karate India Organization in Delhi. The larger controversy seems to be pending before the Kerala High Court and, in view thereof, the Court finds that the said Court is fully empowered even to deal with the petitioner’s grievance which has been raised in the instant petition.

4. The essential, material and integral cause of action, thus, has been found to have arisen outside the jurisdiction of this Court. Merely on the ground that the complaint the Karate India Organization is pending in Delhi, should not be the sole factor to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court. The Supreme Court in the case of ***Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Union of India and Anr.***,¹, has held 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] .]”

¹ (2004) 6 SCC 254.



5. In view thereof, applying the doctrine of *forum conveniens*, the petition, stands dismissed, with liberty to the petitioner to approach the jurisdictional High Court.

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

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

MARCH 23, 2026

aks.