

**DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION
CHANDIGARH DISTRICT COMMISSION
CONSUMER COMPLAINT NO. DC/44/CC/345/2024**

VEERENDRA KUMAR MEENA

PRESENT ADDRESS - s/o Nath Mal Verma r/o HOUSE NO 1020 SECTOR 24B
CHANDIGARH.CHANDIGARH,CHANDIGARH.

KRISHNA MEENA

PRESENT ADDRESS - w/o Veerendra Kumar Meena r/o HOUSE NO 1020 SECTOR 24B
CHANDIGARH.CHANDIGARH,CHANDIGARH.

HRIDHAAN MEENA

PRESENT ADDRESS - s/o Veerendra Kumar Meena r/o HOUSE NO 1020 SECTOR 24B
CHANDIGARH (Minor) through his father Veerendra Kumar Meena s/o Nath Mal Verma r/o H.No.
1020 Sector 24B Chandigarh.CHANDIGARH,CHANDIGARH.

.....Complainant(s)

Versus

AIR INDIA EXPRESS LIMITED

PRESENT ADDRESS - Block-4, VATIKA ONE ON ONE SECTOR 16 NH-48 INDUSTRIAL
ESTATE e (GURGAON), Industrial Estate, Gurgaon, HARYANA through its Managing
Director.CHANDIGARH,CHANDIGARH.

.....Opposite Party(s)

BEFORE:

**HON'BLE PAWANJIT SINGH , PRESIDENT
HON'BLE MR. S.K. SARDANA , MEMBER**

FOR THE COMPLAINANT:

RANA GURTEJ SINGH (Advocate)

DATED: 04/05/2026

ORDER

**DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION-I,
U.T. CHANDIGARH**

Consumer Complaint No.	:	CC/345/2024
Date of Institution	:	22/7/2024

Date of Decision	:	4/5/2026
------------------	---	----------

1. Veerendra Kumar Meena aged about 58 years son of Nath Mal Verma resident of House No 1020 Sector 24B Chandigarh.

2. Krishna Meena aged about 47 years wife of Veerendra Kumar Meena resident of House No 1020 Sector 24B Chandigarh.

3. Hridhaan Meena aged about 16 years son of Veerendra Kumar Meena resident of House No 1020 Sector 24B Chandigarh (Minor) through his father Veerendra Kumar Meena aged about 58 years son of Nath Mal Verma resident of House No 1020 Sector 24B Chandigarh

...Complainants

Versus

1. Air India Express Limited Block-4, Vatika One-on-one Sector-16, NH-48 Industrial Estate (Gurgaon), Industrial Estate, Gurgaon, Haryana through its Managing Director

2. Vidhata Consultancy having office at Shop No.1, Phase 2, Kutia Rd, New Rasila Nagar, Jalandhar, Punjab 144002.

...Opposite Parties

CORAM :

SHRI PAWANJIT SINGH

PRESIDENT

SHRI SURESH KUMAR SARDANA

MEMBER

ARGUED BY : Sh. Sahil Jain, Advocate for Sh. Rana Gurtej Singh,
Advocate for complainant

: Sh. Daksh Prem Azad, Advocate for OP No.1 (through VC)

OP No.2 already exparte.

Per Pawanjit Singh, President

1. The present consumer complaint has been filed by the complainant against the opposite parties (hereinafter referred to as the OP). The brief facts of the case are as under :-

- (a) It transpires from the averments as projected in the consumer complaint that the complainant No.1 is a respected Indian Administrative Service Officer and he along with his wife and 16-year-old son had planned a vacation to Dubai from 9th June 2024 to 17th June 2024. The return journey from Dubai to Amritsar was booked via the Opposite Party Air India Express Airline through a travel agent at a cost of 18,420/- per person having flight number IX 192 from Dubai International Airport to Amritsar International Airport. The copy of the invoice issued by the travel agent is attached herewith as Exhibit C1. The copy of the E- Ticket issued by the Opposite Party is attached herewith as Exhibit C-2. The scheduled departure time of the flight IX 192 was 0850 Hours on 17th June 2024, and the boarding was to commence at 0750 Hours. The complainants reached Dubai International

Airport two and a half hours prior to the departure time and completed all check-in formalities, including receiving their boarding passes and checking in their luggage. The boarding passes were also issued to the Complainants. It was mentioned that the boarding gates would close at 0825 Hours being 25 minutes before the scheduled departure time, i.e. 0850 Hours. The copy of the boarding passes issued to the Complainants are annexed as Exhibit C-3 (Colly). After check-in, the Complainants crossed the security check and reached the designated gate of departure. The complainants reached the boarding gate well before 0825 Hours. Upon reaching the boarding gate before 0825 Hours, the ground staff of the Opposite Party refused to allow the Complainants to board the flight, citing that the boarding process was already completed, though the other passengers were still being boarded while the complainants were denied boarding without any reasonable justification. The Complainants could see that the Aircraft was parked at the gate, while boarding was being denied despite being on time. Even for closure of gates at a time prior to the designated time, no intimation was provided to the Complainants. Due to the negligent and deficient

service provided by the OP, the Complainants were left stranded at Dubai International Airport and were forced to purchase alternative tickets to New Delhi via Jaipur on flight IX 196, which departed Dubai at 1955 Hours on the same day. The additional cost incurred for these alternative tickets was Rs.42,257 per person, causing significant financial hardship to the Complainants. The copy of the invoice for the alternative flights is attached herewith as Exhibit C-4. The e-tickets of the alternative flights are attached herewith as Exhibit C-5(Colly). Due to late arrival of the complainant No1, he could not resume his duty on the next day which led to severe repercussions. The official order of complainant No.1 is annexed as Exhibit C-6. In this manner, the aforesaid act amounts to deficiency in service and unfair trade practice on the part of OP. OP was requested several times to admit the claim, but, with no result. Hence, the present consumer complaint.

- (b) OP No.1 in its reply stated that the Complainants have suppressed material facts. It is alleged that the Complainants knowingly omitted to disclose that they, along with their family member, failed to reach the boarding gate within the stipulated time of 20 minutes prior

to the scheduled departure, i.e., 10:20 AM IST, and instead arrived beyond the prescribed limit. Consequently, the ground staff of the Opposite Party had no option but to treat them as “No Show” passengers, as the boarding gates had already been closed at 10:06 AM IST. It is further highlighted that the Complainants did not reach the boarding gate even at the time of closure, and the boarding pass list annexed as Annexure-OP/3 clearly reflects that the last passenger boarded at 10:06 AM IST. Thus there is no deficiency on the part of the answering OP.

- (c) OP No.2 was properly served and when OP No.2 did not turn up before this Commission, despite proper service, they were proceeded against ex-parte on 27.2.2026.

2. In order to prove their case, complainant tendered/proved their evidence by way of affidavit and supporting documents.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the complainant and OP No.1 and also gone through the file carefully, including the written arguments on record.

- (i) At the very outset, it may be observed that when it is an admitted case of the complainants that the complainants planned a vacation to Dubai from 9th June 2024 to 17th

June 2024 and booked their return ticket from Dubai to Amritsar by paying Rs.18,420/- per person and despite of the fact that the complainants reached in time to board the flight, the OP denied boarding to the complainants without any plausible justification, which forced the complainants to purchase alternative tickets to New Delhi via Jaipur by paying additional amount of Rs.1,26,771/- as is evident from Annexure C-4, the case is reduced to a narrow compass as it is to be determined if the aforesaid act of the OPs amounts to deficiency in service and the complainants are entitled for the relief as prayed for as is the case of the complainant and for that purpose the documentary evidence led by the complainants is required to be scanned carefully.

(ii) Perusal of Annexure C-1 clearly indicates that the complainant had firstly paid an amount of Rs.18420/- each for three return tickets totaling to Rs.55,420/-. Perusal of Annexure C-2 clearly indicates that three tickets were issued to the complainant. Annexure C-3 are boarding passes issued to the complainants further make it clear that the complainants after obtaining boarding passes reached near boarding gate.

(iii) Perusal of Annexure C-4(colly) invoice further indicate that

the complainants paid Rs.1,05,000/- for travelling from Dubai to Jaipur for their return after purchasing alternative tickets and further paid Rs.21,771/- for travelling from Jaipur to Chandigarh thereby incurred a total amount of Rs.1,26,771/- due to negligent act of OP airlines.

Annexure C-5 further indicates that the tickets were issued to the complainants for their journey from Dubai to Jaipur.

- (iv) Thus, as it stands proved on record that the complainants were not allowed to board the flight from Dubai to Amritsar and they were compelled to purchase alternative tickets and pay extra amount of Rs.1,26,771/- as is evident from Annexure C-4 and C-5 and the amount of Rs.55,260/- which was paid by the complainants to the OP for the scheduled return journey from Dubai to Amritsar as is evident from Annexure C-1, was not refunded by the OP to the complainant till date, it is safe to hold that the aforesaid act of OP amounts to deficiency in service and unfair trade practice on the part of OPs. Hence, the instant consumer complaint deserves to be allowed.
- (v) So far as the quantum of relief is concerned, the complainants are entitled for the refund of additional amount paid by them for the ticket from Dubai to Jaipur and

Jaipur to Chandigarh to the tune of Rs.1,26,771/-. However in case the complainants have already received the refund of the amount of Rs.55,260/- from the OP prior to disposal of this case, the same shall be reduced from the said amount.

4. In the light of the aforesaid discussion, the present consumer complaint succeeds, the same is hereby partly allowed and OPs are directed as under :-

- (i) to pay ₹1,26,771/- (less Rs.55,260/- if the same is already refunded by the OP prior to disposal of this case) to the complainants alongwith interest @ 9% per annum (simple) from the date of institution of the present consumer complaint till onwards
- (ii) to pay ₹15,000/- to the complainant/s as compensation for causing mental agony and harassment;
- (iii) to pay ₹10,000/- to the complainants as costs of litigation.

5. This order be complied with by the OPs jointly and severally within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of certified copy thereof,

failing which the amount(s) mentioned at Sr.No.(i) & (ii) above shall carry penal interest @ 12% per annum (simple) from the date of expiry of said period of 45 days, instead of 9% [mentioned at Sr.No.(i)], till realisation, over and above payment of ligation expenses.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed off.

7. Certified copies of this order be sent to the parties free of charge. The file be consigned.

Announced

4/05/2026

mp

[Pawanjit Singh]

President

[Suresh Kumar Sardana]

Member

.....
PAWANJIT SINGH
PRESIDENT

.....J
S.K. SARDANA
MEMBER