



2025:DHC:1285-DB



\$~38

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

+ W.P.(C) 10588/2024 and CM APPL. 43558/2024

**CENTRAL BOARD OF SECONDARY
EDUCATION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY**Petitioner
Through: Mr. S.K. Chaturvedi with Ms.
Shareen, Advocates.

versus

RAVINDRA SINGH AND ORSRespondents
Through:

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL**

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

25.02.2025

%

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. The writ petition is completely misconceived. The order impugned in the present writ petition reads thus :

“Heard.

2. Issue notice to the respondents. Mr. S.K. Chaturvedi, learned counsel, who appears on advance service, accepts notice on behalf of Respondents No. 2 and 3. Ms. Manupriya Verma, learned counsel for Respondent No. 1.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits by way of MA No. 1839/2024, the applicants have sought permission from the Tribunal to file the OA jointly. For the reasons that all the applicants are similarly placed and they have prayed for the similar reliefs on common ground(s), MA stands allowed.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants further adds that MA No. 1840/2024 has been filed by the applicants seeking certain



exemptions. For the reasons stated therein and keeping in view no objection by learned counsel for the respondents, MA stands allowed, subject to just exceptions.

5. Learned counsels for the respondents submit that this Bench of the Tribunal lacks territorial jurisdiction inasmuch as no cause of action has accrued to the applicants, if at all in Delhi. However, learned counsel appearing for the applicants has invited our attention to liberty accorded by the Tribunal to the applicants by Patna Bench of this Tribunal and further, the communication in response to their representations appearing in Annexure A-1, which he submits, has been published on the official portal of Respondents No. 2 and 3 in Delhi. He further submits that otherwise also, the respondents who are expected to consider the representations and/or to grant appropriate reliefs to the applicants are situated in Delhi. However, in view of their illegal and arbitrary action, the OA has been filed and, thus, the Tribunal has the jurisdiction.

6. Let reply be filed by the respondents within four weeks' time. Rejoinder, if any, may be filed within two weeks thereafter.

7. List on 01.08.2024.”

2. We are completely aghast as to how a writ petition could have been filed against this order. It merely records the submissions of the petitioner regarding territorial jurisdiction. There are no findings returned by the Tribunal one way or the other.

3. This petition is, therefore, not maintainable and is accordingly, dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J.

FEBRUARY 25, 2025/yg

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)