



\$~64

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

+ **W.P.(C) 12331/2025 and CAV 308/2025, CM APPL. 50248/2025**

TV VISION LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Sai Deepak, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Shubham Paliwal, Mr. Varun
Garg, Mr. Prashan Jain, Ms. Komal
Bihani, Advocates.

versus

HATHWAY DIGITAL LIMITED & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Swapnil Gupta, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

17.03.2026

1. The Court in the case of ***The Indure Pvt. Ltd. v. Government of NCT of Delhi***,¹ in paragraph no. 36 has taken the following position.

“36. A petitioner who approaches this Court to assail a decision of an authority situated in Delhi, when the underlying cause for the said decision lies elsewhere, effectively attempts to make this High Court a mini-pan-India Superior Court exercising jurisdiction over all events which take place throughout this Country. There is no gainsaying with the proposition that every High Court is competent to adjudicate upon a lis which arises from events or actions taking place within its territory. Merely because the ultimate order, which is based on events taking place outside Delhi and takes cognizance of actions outside of Delhi, is passed within the jurisdiction of this Court, a writ petition ought not be entertained by this Court.”

2. In the instant case, the sole reason to approach this Court is situs of



the Telecom Disputes Settlement and Appellate Tribunal (“TDSAT”) in Delhi. The same, however, cannot be the sole determinative factor to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court, more particularly, in view the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of ***Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Union of India and Anr.***,², wherein the Supreme Court has held as under:

3. “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] .]”

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner prays for some time to take instructions.

5. Acceding to the aforesaid prayer, the hearing stands adjourned till 25.03.2026.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 17, 2026

aks

¹ 2026:DHC:1605.

² (2004) 6 SCC 254.