$~79

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

% ***Date of Decision: October 14th, 2026***

\# **CNR No. DLHC010498902026**

\+ **W.P.(C) 15296/2026**

MR MANPREET SINGH LUTHRA .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aasheesh Gupta, Mr. Palash Aggarwal, Mr. Deepesh Parashar, Ms. Paridhi Chhibber & Ms. Tripti Priya, Advs. (through VC)

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS .....Respondents

Through: Ms. Radhika Bishwajit Dubey, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

AMIT MAHAJAN, J. *(Oral)*

1. The petitioner is essentially aggrieved that despite holding a valid visa, on multiple occasions between December 2024 to July 2026 when the petitioner was travelling, he was subjected to additional verification at departure and arrival immigration counters at IGI Airport, New Delhi each lasting about thirty minutes to an hour.

2. Succinctly stated, the petitioner is an Indian citizen, who is stated to be holding a valid German Business Schengen Visa. The earlier Schengen Visa of the petitioner issued on 10.04.2024 was annulled in September 2024. Thereafter, upon fresh applications, the petitioner was further issued three valid visas. However, in the

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:HARMINDER KAUR
Signing Date:15.10.2026 20:50:42

aftermath of the annulment of the petitioner's earlier Schengen visa, the petitioner was subjected to verification at departure and arrival immigration counters at the IGI Airport on certain occasions. Though the petitioner was allowed to travel each time, the petitioner is aggrieved that despite holding a valid visa, he is being detained and subjected to additional scrutiny.

3. On being asked, the learned counsel for the respondents submits that post the annulment, an alert was issued by the German Embassy to not allow petitioner or anyone else to use the annulled visa to travel to Germany and the said alert is valid till 31.10.2027. It is informed that due to the annulment of the earlier visa, the immigration authority, in due diligence, verifies the petitioner's existing visa from Local Airline Officer.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent further informs that no formal request regarding withdrawal of the annulment alert has been received from the concerned Embassy. She further submits that though the petitioner is subjected to certain questioning the same is at the behest of the German embassy, and the petitioner is allowed to depart each time after his examination by the immigration authorities.

5. Having taken note of the grievance of the petitioner, this Court comes to the conclusion that no effective direction can be passed in the facts of the present case.

6. Pertinently, the Immigration officer is well within its authority to seek information as is necessary. Infact, Section 3 of the Immigration and Foreigners Act, 2025 empowers the Immigration officer to require the traveller to furnish such information as may be

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:HARMINDER KAUR
Signing Date:15.10.2026 20:50:42

necessary and appropriate.

7. As informed by the learned counsel for the respondent, a formal alert was raised by the German Embassy in relation to annulled visa, and the immigration authorities, only in due diligence, were verifying the petitioner's existing visa. Consequently, the mere fact that the petitioner was subjected to additional verification on account of his previously annulled visa, resulting in some inconvenience, cannot, by itself, warrant interference by this Court. It cannot be held that the authorities were arbitrarily exercising their powers. It is not the case of the petitioner that he has, in any manner, been prevented to travel abroad or he has not been allowed to depart after his examination by the immigration authorities.

8. In the light of the aforesaid, no ground to exercise jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is made out.

9. The present petition is accordingly dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 14, 2026
"SS"

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:HARMINDER KAUR
Signing Date:15.10.2026 20:50:42