



2026:AHC:37142

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2481 of 2026

Harshita Sriwastwa

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Of India And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Sanjay Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I., Shiv Kumar Pal

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Sanjay Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Shiv Kumar Pal, counsel for the respondents.
2. A preliminary objection has been raised by Sri Shiv Kumar Pal, counsel for the respondents submits that this Court may not have territorial jurisdiction over the matter, particularly, when the advertisements were issued in New Delhi and selections were conducted in New Delhi. Thus, merely because, the writ petitioner happens to be resident of Ballia would not clothe this Court with territorial jurisdiction.
3. To such a submission, learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the writ petitioner is a resident of District Ballia. Thus, this Court has territorial jurisdiction over the matter.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the records carefully.
5. In the opinion of the Court, once it is not disputed by the learned counsel for the writ petitioner that the advertisement came to be published in New Delhi and the selections were conducted in New Delhi then this Court would not have any 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 is **dismissed** for want of territorial jurisdiction leaving it open to the writ petitioner to approach the Court have territorial jurisdiction over the matter.

February 19, 2026

Ashu

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)