

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No.12956 of 2016
Date of Decision: -04.07.2016

Savgun Samra (minor)

. . . . Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and another

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr.V. K. Sandhir, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J. (ORAL)

This petition is filed by minor through her mother as her natural guardian being aggrieved against the objections dated 26.5.2016 recorded by respondent No.2 on her application made for the purpose of issuance of passport.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that two objections have been raised, while returning the application, namely, total address change and custody of minor has not been mentioned in divorce decree. It is submitted that the application could not have been returned with the said objections as the passport authorities are obliged either to issue the passport or to refuse the same in terms of the provisions of the Passport Act, 1967 [for short 'the Act'].

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

The petitioner, at the first instance, should have made a representation to respondent No.2 raising her grievance against the alleged

uncalled for objections instead of approaching this Court by way of writ petition. The petitioner may, if so advised, at this stage file a representation to respondent No.2 raising her grievance against the aforesaid two objections which are not made out from the facts and are uncalled for, for the purpose of issuance of the passport in terms of the provisions of Section 6 of the Act. If such a representation is made within a week, respondent No.2 shall decide the same as early as possible preferably within a period of 15 days by passing a speaking order.

Disposed of.

04.07.2016

Vivek

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE