



2025:DHC:59-DB



\$~77

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of decision: 07.01.2025

+ W.P.(C) 44/2025 & CM APPLs. 139/2025 & 140/2025
EX CONST CREW HANS RAJPetitioner
Through: Mr.S.S. Pandey & Mr.Roshan
Kumar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr.Abhishek Khanna, SPC
with Mr.Kapil Dev Yadav, GP
& Comm. Hamender, BSF.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for the following reliefs:

“(a) Issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records including the Court of Inquiry which was finalized illegally and used against the Petitioner to pass Impugned Order dated 04.01.2022 vide which Petitioner was dismissed and thereafter quash all such orders including the Court of Inquiry.

(b) Issue a Writ of Mandamus further, by directing the Respondents to permit the petitioner to the issuance of the Writ in the nature of Mandamus by directing the Respondents to permit the petitioner to rejoin services with all consequential benefits.”

2. The Impugned Order dated 04.01.2022 has been passed by the Officer Commanding, Water Wing, BSF, Rajarhat Action Area, New



Town, Kolkata, striking off the petitioner from the strength of the Water Wing, BSF, Rajarhat with effect from 04.01.2022, *inter alia* observing as under:

“3. Under the provision of Rule-17 of BSF Rules-1969, No.160800988 CT/Crew Hansraj of Water Wings BSF Rajarhat was given an opportunity to show cause vide this HQ Letter No.WW/Estt./5797/2021/3679 dated 8th July 2021 against his proposed termination from service. His reply to the show cause notice Vide 78 Bn BSF Letter No. Prov/SCOI/78 BN/2021/10945 dated 31st Aug' 2021 has been examined by the undersigned and I am not satisfied with the explanation offered by him and considered his further retention in the force to be undesirable. Hence, in exercise of the power vested upon me under section 11(2) of the BSF Act, 1968, No. 160800988 CT/Crew Hansraj at Water Wing BSF Rajarhat is hereby dismissed from the service under Rule-17 of the BSF Rule- 1969 w.e f. 04 Jan. 2022 (AN).”

3. The order, having been passed at Kolkata, we enquired from the petitioner as to how he invoked the jurisdiction of this Court for entertaining the present petition. In response, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that as the Impugned Order places reliance on the Court of Inquiry that was conducted at Delhi and which had found that neither the Swimming Experience Certificate (Reference No.25 dated 23.06.2015) was issued to the petitioner by the Adventure and Coaching Center, Jaipur Road, New Aadars Nagar, Kotputli, Distt. Jaipur (Rajasthan), nor the Boat Handling Experience Certificate (ref. No 0064 of 07/03/15) was issued to him by Dhana Laxmi Water Wing Mechanised Fishing Boat, Chinnamavari Street, Visakhapatnam, basis



whereof the petitioner had obtained appointment in the BSF, this Court would have the jurisdiction to entertain the present petition.

4. We do not find any merit in the submissions made. The petitioner for invoking the jurisdiction of this Court, in the writ petition has pleaded as under:

“19. That the petitioner have the cause of action to approach this Hon’ble Court because he not only the Inquiry was finalized in Delhi but even the received such decision to terminate him was issued from Delhi though the orders of dismissal was passed orders in Delhi but even the entire process of selection has been carried out in Delhi. Therefore, the petitioner have approached this Hon’ble Court by way of Present Writ Petition.”

(Emphasis supplied)

5. Apart from the fact that the Impugned Order dismissing the petitioner from service has not been issued at Delhi, it is trite law that “cause of action” means a bundle of facts which is necessary for the petitioner to prove in order to succeed in the proceedings. It does not completely depend upon a character of the relief prayed for by the petitioner. A small part of the cause of action arising within the territorial jurisdiction of a High Court may not be considered as a determinative factor compelling the High Court to decide the matter on its own merits. In such a case, the doctrine of *forum non conveniens* shall apply.

6. In the present case, before passing the Impugned Order, a Show Cause Notice had been issued to the petitioner at Kolkata, and the reply of the petitioner to the same is stated to have been considered

