



\$~80

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9160/2025 and CM APPL.43005/2025**

SEIDEL ANNA LOUISE

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Amit George, Mr. Dhiraj
Abraham Philip, Mr. Febin Matrew
Varghese, Ms. Ibansara Syiemlieh,
Ms. Soyarchan Khangrah and Mr. B.
A. Pamidighantam, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Arnav Kumar and Mr. Adit Garg,
Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

09.12.2025

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking that the petitioner be provided the information/ reasons for the refusal of her entry into India on 16.05.2025, despite possessing a valid visa. The said petition was disposed of *vide* order dated 07.07.2025 in the following terms:-

"1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking the following prayers:-

"a) Issue a Writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondents to inform Petitioner regarding the reasons for Petitioner's deportation and refusal of her entry into India;

b) Issue a Writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondent to inform Petitioner regarding the issuance of any LOC/Blacklisting order issued or pending against Petitioner;

c) Issue a writ of or in the nature of mandamus or any other order, writ or direction quashing any oral or written direction passed by the Respondent barring Petitioner's entry into India;

d) In the event of any LOC/order/direction operating against the Petitioner, issue a Writ of mandamus quashing the same;

e) In the event of any LOC/order/direction operating against the Petitioner,



issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondent to provide the material/documents on the basis on which the order has been passed;

f) Issue a writ of or in the nature of Certiorari or any other writ, order or direction calling for the records of the Petitioner's case; “

2. Learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner, an Australian national, despite possessing e-business visa (with validity upto 05.06.2025) was refused entry into India on 16.05.2025 and was deported by the concerned authorities without providing any information/reasons for the said action.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that despite filing a detailed representation on 26.06.2025 seeking information/reasons for the refusal/deportation, respondents have failed to respond to the same.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that reasons for refusing entry to the petitioner shall be duly supplied to the petitioner within a period of one week from today. The said statement is taken on record.

5. In the circumstances, the grievance of the petitioner stands redressed. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of.

6. All other rights and remedies of the petitioner are left open for consideration in appropriate proceedings”.

2. Thereafter, CM APPL. 43005/2025 came to be filed by the Bureau of Immigration/BoI (respondent no.2) seeking modification of the aforesaid order dated 07.07.2025 to the extent it directs the Bureau of Immigration to furnish reasons directly to the petitioner. It is *inter alia* prayed in the said application as under:-

“Allow the present Application and modify its Order dated 07.07.2025 to the extent it directs BoI to furnish reasons for refusal of Petitioner's entry on 16.05.2025 to the Petitioner directly”.

3. It is noticed that in the CM APPL. 43005/2025, it has been categorically averred as under:-

6. It is imperative to clarify that BoI has no difficulty in disclosing to this Hon'ble Court, the reasons for refusing Petitioner's entry into India. The Petitioner was denied entry into India on 16.05.2025 as there is a LOC which exists against the Petitioner at the behest of Foreigner Regional Registration Office (in short FRRO), Kolkata.



4. As such, the reasons for refusing the petitioner's entry into India have been clearly disclosed in the application even though the same have not been provided directly to the petitioner. The same effectively redresses the grievance of the petitioner as canvassed in the present petition.

5. In the above background, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a copy of the concerned LOC be provided to the petitioner. The said request, however falls beyond the scope of the present petition. Moreover, the FRRO has taken a clear stand in these proceedings that copy of the LOC cannot be supplied to the petitioner inasmuch as the concerned document/s are classified as 'secret' and 'confidential' by the competent authority of Foreigners Division, Ministry of Home Affairs, wherein power of issuance of LOCs has been delegated only to some competent authorities, and copies of such documents are not meant to be disclosed.

6. It is further submitted that Intelligence Bureau/ Bureau of Immigration falls under the exempted category of departments/ offices under Section 24 r/w Second Schedule of the Right to Information Act, 2005. Hence, the details provided by BoI can only be used for the purpose of official investigations and cannot be shared with any individual or private agency. In view of the same, there should not be any unauthorized access of these classified documents by the LOC subject, or by any representative acting on his/her behalf.

7. In any event, in these proceedings, this Court is not required to adjudicate upon the above aspect, except to leave it open to the petitioner to assail the impugned LOC in accordance with law. If and when such proceedings are initiated by the petitioner, the necessity of directing the



respondents to produce the relevant documents or the request received from the originating agency shall be duly considered at that stage.

8. No further orders are required to be passed in the present proceedings or in the instant application. The same stands disposed of.

SACHIN DATTA, J

DECEMBER 9, 2025/uk