



\$~60

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3233/2025**

**PANKAJ KUMAR YADAV**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Bansal, Ms. Veena  
Bansal, Mr. Gaurav Yadav & Mr. Saurav  
Jindal, Advs

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jagdish Chandra, CGSC,  
with Mr. Vasuchit Anand, GP, Mr. Shubham  
Kumar Mishra, Advocate with Mr. Y.S.  
Rathore, AC, CISF and Mr. Rohtash, ASI,  
CISF, for R1 to 3

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL**

**ORDER**

%

**20.03.2025**

1. On the last date of hearing, this Court had protected the petitioner till today as it had some misgivings about the territorial jurisdiction of the Court to entertain the present writ petition. Our attention has since been invited, albeit in another case, to an order dated 24 August 2012 of the Supreme Court in the case of **Abrar Ali v CISF<sup>1</sup>**, in which the Supreme Court has set aside the order of this Court refusing to entertain the petition for want of territorial jurisdiction, observing that the Head Quarters of the concerned para military force was located in Delhi.

---

<sup>1</sup> Civil Appeal No. 6020/2012

W.P.(C) 3233/2025



2. In that view of the matter, we do not intend to reject this petition for want of territorial jurisdiction.

3. On merits, the petitioner is aggrieved by termination order dated 11 March 2025 by which the petitioner was terminated from service with immediate effect. This writ petition was filed before this Court on 11 March 2025.

4. The ground for terminating the petitioner's service was that, at the address in Tinsukia, which had been provided in his Domicile Certificate, no one was found present, when a team from the office of District Commissioner, District Tinsukia visited the premises. The petitioner had submitted that his mother was staying with his sister, as she was of advanced age. The petitioner had, therefore, requested the respondent to revisit the premises; however, instead of doing so, the impugned order of termination came to be passed.

5. The respondent has also placed on record the Death Certificate of his father which indicates his residence to be at Village Dhekiyajuri Bengal, Gaon Post Sripuria, Thana Tinsukia, Tehsil Tinsukia, Dist. Tinsukia, State Assam.

6. As such the petitioner has made out a *prima facie* case. In view thereof, let formal notice be issued in this writ petition.

7. Notice is accepted on behalf of Respondents 1 to 3 by Mr. Jagdish Chandra, learned Central Government Standing Counsel.



8. Let notice be issued to Respondent 4, by all modes.
9. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within ten days with an advance copy to learned counsel for the petitioner who may file rejoinder thereto before the next date of hearing.
10. As the issue in controversy is limited, list for disposal on 15 April 2025.
11. Till the next date of hearing, interim order dated 12 March 2025 shall continue to remain in operation.
12. The respondent is also directed to conduct a re-verification of the domicile of the petitioner, based on the Death certificate of the petitioner's father and place a report in that regard, on record, before the next date of hearing.
13. We clarify that the date of "11 March 2025" in para 10 of the order dated 12 March 2025 would read "17 March 2025".

*Dasti.*

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

**AJAY DIGPAUL, J.**

**MARCH 20, 2025/yg/dsn**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*