

\$~18

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

+ W.P.(C) 6104/2019

NEELAM ANEJA AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr Chirag Aneja, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Ajay Digpaul, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

30.05.2019

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

“1) To direct the respondents to re-open the investigation of the petitioner’s with respect to the application No. 28131482 which was closed vide communication letter dated 13.2.2019 by respondent No. 1;

2) To direct the respondents to dispose off the application of the petitioner within four weeks from disposing off the present writ petition.”

2. The petitioners state that they had applied for permission to operate as a non-scheduled operator for non-scheduled Air Transport Services. It is further stated that the petitioners had incorporated a company – M/s Aerojet Aviation Private Limited – for the said purpose.

3. The registered office of the said company was located at M-21, Ground Floor, Saket, New Delhi-110017 and the said details, alongwith the

copy of the bank statement and PAN Card, were also provided to respondent no.1. On 25.06.2018, the petitioners state that a letter dated 25.06.2018 (reference no. AAPL/NSOP/02-2018) was received at the registered office of Aerojet Aviation Private Limited. In terms of the said letter, respondent no.1 had called upon the addressee to provide accurate office address of the said company.

4. The petitioners claim that the said letter was responded to and once again the petitioners had submitted the complete details of the registered office of the company, Aerojet Aviation Private Limited.

5. The petitioners' application has been rejected by a letter dated 13.02.2018. A plain reading of the letter indicates that the same has been rejected on the sole ground that the inquiries had revealed that the address of the aforesaid company was incorrect and, therefore, the proposal could not be examined. The petitioners stoutly dispute the aforesaid ground, as it is asserted that the registered office is located at the given address and is functional during normal business hours.

6. In view of the above, the impugned order is set aside and the respondents are directed to conduct a fresh inquiry to verify the address of the company, as stated above. If the same is found correct, the respondents will process the petitioners' application in accordance with law within a period of four weeks from today.

7. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

8. Order *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

MAY 30, 2019/MK