



\$~145

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

+ W.P.(C) 13097/2025 and CM APPL.53645/2025

CHAUDHARY AVIATION FACILITY PVT LTD .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravinder Kumar Yadav, Ms. Arti Anupriya, Mr. Kartikey, Mr. Paras Juneja, Mr. Kanishk Yadav and Ms. Kritika Yadav, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, CGSC, Ms. Himanshi Singh and Mr. Sainyam Bhardwaj, Advs.  
Mr. Shubham Tyagi, SSC, Ms. Navriti Ojha, Mr. Harish Saini and Mr. Rishabh Chauhan, Advs. for R-2.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA**

**ORDER**

%

**27.08.2025**

1. The present petition has been filed in the backdrop of an order dated 23.07.2025, passed in the context of W.P.(C) 10582/2025 (also filed by the present petitioner). The said order reads as under:

*“1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing a communication dated 27.06.2025 whereby a contract dated 07.03.2025, which was awarded to the petitioner for a period of one year from 01.04.2025 to 31.03.2026 has been terminated w.e.f. 26.07.2025.*

*2. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contends that the said termination is arbitrary, and has been done abruptly without even giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. He submits that the action taken against the petitioner is wholly mala fide and at the behest of certain vested interests.*

*3. The above contentions are refuted by learned counsel for the*



*respondent.*

*4. It is evident that there are disputed questions as regards the conspectus in which the impugned termination action has been taken against the petitioner.*

*5. Be that as it may, since the respondent no.2 has terminated the contract without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, the said respondent is directed to afford a post-decisional hearing to the petitioner. The respondent no.2 shall take into account all the contentions of the petitioner including those raised in the present writ petition. Let a reasoned order be passed by the respondent no.2 thereafter.*

*6. In case the above does not redress the grievance/s of the petitioner, it would be at liberty to avail appropriate civil remedies against the respondent.*

*7. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. Pending application also stands disposed of.”*

2. The short point raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that, although a post-decisional hearing was granted to the petitioner, the resultant order dated 04.08.2025 (annexed as Annexure-P1 to the present petition) is unreasoned.

3. It is evident from a perusal of the impugned order that it does not contain any reasons whatsoever. The cryptic conclusion drawn in the order as set out therein, is as under:

*“After due consideration of the submissions made during the hearing and the material on record, this office, having duly complied with the Hon’ble Court’s directions, hereby conveys that it has been decided that the termination of the contract shall remain in effect, as already conveyed vide Notice dated 27.06.2025, issued under Contract No.GEMC-511687712619293 dated 07.03.2025.”*

4. In the circumstances, with consent of learned counsel for the respondent, who appears on advance notice, the present petition is disposed



of with a direction to the concerned officer / authority, who granted post-decisional hearing to the petitioner to pass a reasoned order, clearly setting out the basis of the termination action taken against the petitioner, and dealing with the contentions of the petitioner.

5. Let the same be done within a period of four weeks from today.

6. Needless to say, it shall be open to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedies as regards the contractual / termination action taken by the respondents.

7. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. Pending application/s also stands disposed of.

**SACHIN DATTA, J**

**AUGUST 27, 2025/cl**