



2026:AHC:32607

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2220 of 2026

Suresh Chandra

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

The Union Of India And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Abhishek Singh, Kamla Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I., Ashok Singh

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Ms. Kamla Singh, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Ashok Singh, learned Standing Counsel for the State.
2. At the very outset, a preliminary objection has been raised by Sri Ashok Singh who appears for the respondents that this Court may not be territorial jurisdiction over the matter particularly wherein writ of quo warranto has been sought against the respondent no. 4 who happens to be posted in Arunachal Pradesh and the official respondents are stationed in New Delhi.
3. To such a submission, Ms. Kamla Singh, learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the writ petitioner happens to be resident of Kanpur Dehat whereas the fourth respondent against whom writ of quo warranto has been sought is the resident of Kanpur Dehat. Thus, this Court would have territorial jurisdiction over the matter.
4. I have heard the submissions so made across the bar and perused the record.
5. Apparently, the fourth respondent is posted in Arunachal Pradesh and so far as the official respondents are concerned they are in New Delhi and the writ petitioner is the resident of Kanpur Dehat and his place of birth is Kanpur Dehat, thus, this Court has no territorial jurisdiction over the matter.
6. Accordingly, in view of the law laid down by this Court in **Rajendra Kumar Mishra Vs. Union of India (2005) 1 UPLBEC 108**. Interference

is declined, the writ petition stands **disposed of** leaving it open to the writ petitioner to approach the Court having territorial jurisdiction over the matter.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

February 13, 2026
Rajesh