



\$~50

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

CNR No. DLHC010351522025

+ **W.P.(C) 7723/2025, CM APPL. 34240/2025 & CM APPL. 48919/2026**

MAYANK GOEL

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. R. Gopal, Advocate.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: **Ms. Shagun Shahi Chugh, Mr. Varun Chugh and Ms. Ayushi Agarwal, Advocates for UOI.
Mr. Aniket Aggarwal and Ms. Priya Chauhan, Mr. Amar Gupta, Advocates for R-3.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **24.08.2026**

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking following prayers:

“I. Pass necessary writ, order, or direction in the nature of mandamus to the Respondents No. 1 and 2, to decide the Representation, dt., 105.09.2024, questioning the terms and conditions of domestic air travel of infant passengers of the IndiGo to be opaque, unfair and arbitrary and violative of the basic norms under sections 23 read with section 24 of the India Contract Act, 1872, and that the Agreements offered by IndiGo to infant air passengers ought to be just, fair and reasonable and do not offend the public policy;

II. Direct the concerned Respondents No. 1 and 2 to ensure a rule based internal system of grievance redressal of the IndiGo customers in conformity with the fundamental rights guaranteed under articles 14, 19



(d), and 21, read with article 39 (c) and (f), and article 45 of the Directive Principles of the Stato Policy, for better, safer, and convenient domestic air travel of infant air passengers and their accompanying parents or guardians; III. Direct the Respondents- No. 1 and 2 to ensure that the internal terms and conditions of air travel by the infant passengers of the IndiGo are compatible with and not obstructive in nature so that any remedy sought by affected dissatisfied consumer maybe effectively dealt with by the Grievance Redressal Forums created by the Consumer Protection Act, 2019;

IV. Direct the Respondent No. 1 to impose fine on the Respondent No. 3, after conducting enquiry, in the interest of justice, in view of the arbitrary, unfair and deliberate efforts made by the IndiGo not to resolve the grievance of the infant air passenger son of the Petitioner and for obstructing the access to justice, under section Consumer Protection Act, 2019, by withholding supply of the existing terms and conditions of air travel to the Petitioner,

V. Direct Respondent no. 3 to pay the cost of litigation to the petitioner.”

2. Issue notice. Ms. Shagun Shahi Chugh, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent no. 1/UOI. Mr. Aniket Aggarwal, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent no. 3.
3. After hearing learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and having regard to the issue involved in the present petition, this Court finds it appropriate to direct that the present petition be treated as a representation on behalf of the petitioner. In case the petitioner seeks to urge any other grievance, he shall be at liberty to file a fresh writ petition in respect thereof, in addition to the present petition. The respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation within a period of eight weeks from the date of filing of the fresh representation by the petitioner before the respondents, under intimation to the petitioner.
4. In above terms, the present petition along with pending applications, if any, stands disposed of.
5. In case of any further grievance, the petitioner will be at liberty to approach this Court.



6. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

AUGUST 24, 2026/vc

VS