



\$~85

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

+ **W.P.(C) 19310/2025**

DAMODAR VALLEY CORPORATION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhinav Mukerji (Sr. Adv.) with
Ms. Payal Kakra, Mr. Ehraz Zafar,
Pranav, Mr. Veerashwar S. Jadaun,
and Ms. Khusboo Hora, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Rukhmini Bobde, CGSC with
Mr. Rahul, GP, Mr. Jatin Dhamija,
Mr. Vinayak Aren, Ms. Aishwarya
Nigam, Advocates for R-1 to 4.
Mr. Santosh Kumar Rout, Adv. for
Bank.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

25.02.2026

1. The only reason assigned by the petitioner to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court is that the office of the respondents is situated in Delhi and the entire deliberation has taken place in Delhi. It be noted that the mine in question regarding which the compensation is sought for situates outside the jurisdiction of this Court.

2. The Court in case of **Indure Pvt. Ltd. v. Government of NCT of Delhi and Ors.**¹ and especially in paragraphs 36 to 38 has held as under:

“36. A petitioner who approaches this Court to assail a decision of an

¹ 2026:DHC:1605



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.

37. Naturally, being the capital of the Country, various authorities and bodies having pan-India jurisdiction would be located within the jurisdiction of this Court. Merely because the decision making authority happens to be in Delhi, ought not to be the sole reason to entertain a lis in this Court. The decision, no doubt, may be passed in the national capital, but it is usually against persons situated outside Delhi; and even more importantly, for actions which took place beyond the borders of this Court. The act of giving a hearing in Delhi, or the passing of an order in Delhi, is merely a result of a body/authority being situated in the national capital, it has nothing to do with the lis, the offending action, the legal injury or the foundational facts on the basis of which action is being taken.

38. The case-law cited above, makes repeated reference to “dominant facts”, and facts which are “material, essential and integral” to the lis in question. In most cases, the fact that the order is passed, or the head office is located, or that opportunity of hearing was afforded, within the jurisdiction of this Court is completely immaterial, non-essential, and non-integral to the dispute in question. Any of the aforementioned three aspects could very well have taken place in another part of the Country, it is for the sole reason that Delhi is the national capital, that, in most cases these factors get connected to the jurisdiction of this Court. From another lens, it may be seen that regardless of what the underlying facts or legal injury/infringement may be, the order impugned would, in an overwhelming number of cases be passed from Delhi. If this be the case, can this constant factum, which shall remain present in each case, be considered a “dominant fact” or a “material, essential and integral” fact? The answer must be in the negative.”

3. It has been noted by the Court that the mere presence of the decision-making authority being in Delhi, ought not to be the sole reason to entertain writ petitions by this Court.
4. Let the petitioner to satisfy as to why the Court should continue to entertain the writ petition.



5. List on 17.03.2026.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J
FEBRUARY 25, 2026/P/AMG