



\$~21

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

+ W.P.(C) 8049/2024

UETA INC & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Arunabh Chowdhury, Senior
Adv., Mr Karma Dorjee, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs Anjana Gosain, Ms. Shreya
Manjari, Advs
Mr. Amar Gupta, Mr. Mohit Sharma,
Advs for R-3&4.
Mr. Ramji Srinivasan, Sr Adv., Mr.
Milanka Chaudhury, Ms Ashly
Cherian, Mr. Shivankar Sukul, Ms.
Shefali Munde, Advs. for R-5.
Mr. Rahul Sangwan, Adv for R-6

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

13.02.2026

CM APPL. 10106/2026

1. This is an application filed by the petitioner placing on record the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No. 1671/2026, wherein, the Supreme Court has set aside the judgment dated 17.12.2025 by stating in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the order as under:

“9. We, therefore, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, especially when the writ petition remained pending before the High Court for a substantial period, it makes out a fit case to invoke our power under Article 142 of the Constitution.



Accordingly, we allow the appeal in part, set aside the impugned judgment dated 17.12.2025 and request the High Court to proceed with the decision of the Writ Petition (Civil) No.8049 of 2024, including any other connected writ petitions or applications on merits, after hearing learned counsel for the parties.

10. It is clarified that this order shall not be construed to mean that, in every case where respondent Nos. 4, 5 or any other contesting respondents issue a tender and/or enter into any contractual obligation, jurisdiction would automatically vest in the Courts at Delhi including the High Court, merely because of such issuance or even by virtue of any written agreement to that effect, especially when the tender was floated and all subsequent activities were undertaken in Noida or at any place outside Delhi. The question of territorial jurisdiction, thus, will essentially depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case; this order shall not be a binding precedent to be followed in other matters. We request the High Court to decide the petition expeditiously.”

2. In effect, this application is listed for hearing of the writ petition on merits.

3. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 8049/2024

4. Though, we find that Mr. Rahul Sangwan, learned counsel for respondent no. 6 was also appearing for respondent no.1, he however submits that he shall take instructions whether to appear for respondent no. 7 as well.

5. List on 27.02.2026.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2026

tg