



\$~40

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5660/2025**

PARVEEN TRAVELS PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Vishal Khattar, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Anjana Gosain, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **25.03.2026**

CM APPL. 25797/2025 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5660/2025

3. The petition is for setting aside order dated 20.02.2025 passed by respondent no. 2-Bureau of Civil Aviation Security [BCAS], whereby, Security Clearance of the petitioner for operating as an Auxiliary Service provider has been rejected. Further, a prayer for setting aside order dated 17.04.2025 passed by the Ministry of Civil Aviation, Union of India (appellate authority) has been made.
4. The Court finds that, earlier, on 27.03.2019, the BCAS has accorded Security Clearance to the petitioner to operate as an Auxiliary Service Provider at Chennai Airport for a period of five years. Thereafter, on 30.04.2024, the petitioner applied for renewal of the Security Clearance.



However, the said application has been rejected by the concerned authorities *vide* the impugned orders on the basis of an adverse report from the Central Security Agency [CSA]. The appellate authority has also noted that under AVSEC Order No. 01/2017, formulated under Section 5 of the Aircraft Act, 1934, Security Clearance and Security Programme duly approved by the BCAS is mandatory for business establishments to commence business.

5. Mr. Vishal Khattar, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the underlying reasons for the rejection of Security Clearance have not been supplied to the petitioner. He submits, further, that the impugned orders are cryptic and non-speaking. According to him the impugned orders deserve to be set aside.

6. Ms. Anjana Gosain, learned counsel for the respondents, submits that the aspect of granting Security Clearance involves questions of natural security. She places reliance on the decision of this Court in ***Celebi Airport Services India Pvt. Ltd. v. UOI & Ors.***,¹ and submits that the impugned action would not be subject to judicial review once national security considerations are found to exist for the same.

7. She, further, submits that in such cases, even the principles of natural justice have no application. Reliance is placed on the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Ex. Armymen's Protection Services P. Ltd. v. UOI & Ors.***²

8. She places reliance on the decision of this Court in ***Add Lounge Services Private Limited v. UoI & Ors.***,³ and submits that requirement for Security Clearance is not restricted only to the corporate business entity, but

¹ 2025:DHC:5340

² Judgment dated 26.02.2014 in C.A. 2876 of 2014



also to the individuals controlling/managing it.

9. It is seen that the stand taken by the respondents is that the rejection of Security Clearance of the petitioner is in view of national security considerations. As has been held by this Court in ***Celebi Airport Services India Pvt. Ltd.*** In view thereof, the respondents necessarily ought to satisfy the Court that national security considerations did, in fact, form the basis of the impugned action.

10. Therefore, the respondents are directed to furnish to the Court the relevant material forming the basis of the impugned action.

11. List on 18.05.2026.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 25, 2026

tr