

\$~1

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

+ W.P.(C) 3499/2016

NAZIA SULTANA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Alamgir, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS Respondents

Through: Ms. Archana Gaur, Adv. for UOI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

ORDER

% **29.04.2016**

CM Appl. 14992/2016

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

WP(C) 3499/2016

The present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to respondent nos. 2 and 3 to restore petitioner's passport, which was impounded at the airport on 28th March, 2016.

Petitioner further seeks a direction to respondent no. 2-Regional Passport Officer not to take any coercive action against the petitioner under Section 10(3)(b) of the Passports Act, 1967 in pursuance to communications dated 12th November, 2014, 21st November, 2014 and 7th January, 2015, whereby petitioner was asked to show cause as to why action should not be taken against her under Section 10(3)(b) of the Passports Act, 1967 as she had submitted a fake verification certificate.

It has been averred in the petition that petitioner approached respondent no. 4-Rudra Travel Experts to get a passport on urgent basis as she had been offered a job in UAE. It has been further averred that upon receiving the passport, petitioner left for UAE on 26th November, 2014.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that respondent no. 4 misguided the petitioner and furnished a fake verification certificate.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that while impounding the passport, the petitioner was informed by officials of respondent No.3 that respondent no. 4 is engaged in fraudulent acts and is involved in many criminal cases of fraud and cheating.

Learned counsel for the petitioner lastly states that petitioner has to report back to her duties at UAE to complete her contract period and, therefore, she urgently requires her passport.

In the present case, the admitted position is that a fake verification certificate has been furnished. As to whether the petitioner or respondent No. 4 is responsible for the same, cannot be decided in the present proceedings.

This Court is also of the opinion that since respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are taking action in accordance with law on admitted facts, the same cannot be quashed. Consequently, the present writ petition is dismissed.

MANMOHAN, J

APRIL 29, 2016
NG