



2026:DHC:2110



\$~30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 14337/2023**

Date of Decision: **11.03.2026**

PRATIK CHAUDHARY & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Shubham Tyagi, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR CUM PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Advitiya Awasthi, Mr. Devjeet
Brahmand, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV
JUDGEMENT

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The petition is for setting aside the order dated 20.04.2023 passed by the Central Information Commission (CIC) in second appeal with respect to the petitioner's RTI application dated 08.12.2022.
2. It appears that the application dated 08.12.2022 was made to the respondent for information regarding the recruitment of certain employee of Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.
3. Therefore, it is seen that the sole reason for invoking the jurisdiction of this Court is that one of the impugned orders has been passed by the CIC which is situated within the jurisdiction of this Court. However, the material, integral, and essential part of the cause of action is the original application,



which was made to the University which is situated outside the jurisdiction of this Court. Merely, the CIC being situated in Delhi, cannot be the sole determinative factor for entertaining the instant petition.

4. The aforesaid is the position taken by the Court in the case of ***Indure Pvt. Ltd. v. Government of NCT of Delhi and Ors.***¹ in paragraphs no. 36 to 38, which are reproduced below, for reference:

“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.

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

¹ 2026:DHC:1605



2026:DHC:2110



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.”

5. In view thereof, the instant petition stands dismissed on the ground of territorial jurisdiction.
6. If the petitioner so desires, shall be at liberty to approach the jurisdictional High Court.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 11, 2026/P