



\$~75

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

+ W.P.(C) 5660/2025

PARVEEN TRAVELS PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Vishal Khattar, Ms. Vandana
Kapoor, Mr. Shobhit Vyas and Ms.
Shreya Verma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Anjana Gosain, Mr. Anuj Kumar
and Mr. Keshav Raheja, Advs. for R-
1 to 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **30.04.2025**

CM APPL.25796/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5660/2025 and CM APPL.25797/2025

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing order dated 20.02.2025 passed by respondent no.2/ Bureau of Civil Aviation Security (BCAS) and appeal order dated 17.04.2025 passed by the respondent no.1/ Ministry of Civil Aviation, Union of India. In terms of the said orders, the petitioner's application dated 30.04.2024 for security clearance to operate as Auxiliary Service Provider at the Chennai International Airport was rejected.
4. The petitioner in the present petition is a company engaged in providing car rentals, fleet management services and other related services



across India. It is stated that in the year 2014, the office of the Deputy Inspector General, Central Industrial Security Forces (CISF), Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India awarded a contract to the petitioner pertaining to 'hiring of 11 buses (42+1 seater) and 1 tempo-traveller (15-seater) in non-AC category on Round-the-clock basis for respondent no.3 at the Chennai International Airport'. It is stated that since then the petitioner has been performing the said work. The said contract, was renewed in February, 2025 for a period of 2 years from 01.03.2025 to 28.02.2025 by respondent no.3, subject to obtaining a security clearance from respondent no.2/ BCAS.

5. It is further stated that for the purpose of renewing security clearance, the petitioner received a certificate of satisfaction from respondent no.3 on 19.02.2024 and also a recommendation dated 05.03.2024 to obtain approval of security program from the Chief Security Officer, Airport Authority of India, Chennai Airport.

6. Pursuant thereto, the petitioner through E-Sahaj platform applied for security clearance from respondent no.2. However, respondent no.2 *vide* impugned order dated 20.02.2025 rejected the aforesaid application of the petitioner.

7. Against the aforesaid order, the petitioner preferred an appeal under Rule 64 of the Aircraft (Security) Rules, 2023 before respondent no.1. *Vide* impugned order dated 01.03.2025, the respondent no.1 upheld the decision passed by respondent no.2. In the above background, the present petition has been filed by the petitioner.

8. Issue notice.

9. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accepts notice on behalf of the



respondents. She seeks some time to take instructions.

10. In the circumstances, list on 08.05.2025 in the category of '*supplementary matters*'.

SACHIN DATTA, J

APRIL 30, 2025/cl