



\$~6

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 236/2023**

**PARAS NARSI THROUGH SEJAL KUMAR SOLANKI**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Wadhwa and Mr.  
Abhishek Wadhwa, Advocates

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukul Singh, CGSC with Ms. Ira  
Singh, Advocates for R-1, 4, 5 & 7  
Mr. Rajiv Nayyar, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Shivam, Advocate for R-2  
Mr. Digvijay Rai and Mr. Archit  
Mishra, Advocates (through VC) for  
R-3 and Mr. Sachin Yadav, AGM  
(Law)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA**

**ORDER**

% **24.05.2023**

1. The learned senior counsel for the Respondent No.2, Air India Ltd. states that a compliance affidavit has been filed on behalf of Respondent No.2. However, as per the report of the registry, the same has been returned under objections. Respondent No. 2 is directed to have the same placed on record.

2. The learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.4, Foreigner Regional Registration Officer ('FRRO'), seeks time to file his affidavit to the contempt petition as well as the response, if any, to the compliance affidavit filed by Respondent No.2. It is ordered accordingly.



3. The Petitioner as well is at liberty to file the response, if any, to the affidavits filed by Respondent Nos. 2 and 4.

4. Mr. Digvijay Rai, learned counsel for Respondent No. 3, Airport Authority of India ('AAI') states that in compliance of the directions issued by this Court *vide* order dated 24.02.2023, Respondent no. 3 had taken steps to personally inform the director of DIAL. He states that since the order dated 22.02.2023 has been complied with, Respondent No.3 has no further role in these proceedings and may be deleted from the array of the parties.

4.1. The learned counsel for the Petitioner states that Respondent Nos. 3 and 6 were not enjoined with any responsibility to enforce the orders dated 22.02.2023 and have been arrayed as parties only to seek effective compliance. He states he has no objection to their deletion.

4.2. Accordingly, Respondent No. 3 and 6 are deleted from array of parties.

4.3. The Petitioner is directed to file an amended memo of parties within one (1) week.

5. In the facts of this case, the Petitioner continued to remain inside the International Terminal, Delhi till 24.02.2023, inspite of the specific directions issued by the Division Bench on 22.02.2023 to permit the Petitioner to travel to Ahmedabad. It is the stand of Respondent No. 2 that it had no communication with the Petitioner herein during this period and was unaware about the order dated 22.02.2023.

5.1. To redress the aforesaid issue and avoid a repeat of the same, the Respondent No.2 is directed to file an additional affidavit placing on record the mechanism, if any, which has been put in place to enable communication between the passengers held back by FRRO at the International Terminal



and the responsible officials of Air India Ltd., within six (6) weeks.

6. List on 06.11.2023.

**MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J**

**MAY 24, 2023/rk/aa**