

\$~3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 710/2017**

RAJBIR KAUR Petitioner
Through Mr. Rajiv Gupta, Adv.

versus

BIRENDRA KUMAR & ANR Respondents
Through Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC, for R-1 & R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER
% **10.11.2017**

Petitioner has filed the instant petition alleging violation of the directions given in judgment dated 17.12.2014. Mr. Soni, ld. CGSC for the respondents points out that the operation of the said judgment is stayed vide order passed on 18.1.2016 in LPA 13/2016. Be that as it may, the foundation for filing of the instant petition, is the order dated 6.12.2016, the relevant portion whereof is, as under :

“2. Kindly note that the impugned order of the RPO, Jalandhar, denying you passport facility was conveyed to you as per the directions of the Central government. Also, as per section 11 of the Passports Act, 1967, no appeal lies against the decision of the Central Government which was conveyed in the impugned order itself.

3. Your appeal against the impugned order of the RPO, Jalandhar cannot be admitted u/s 11 of the Passports Act, 1967.”

The above-said communication by itself, only adverts to the maintainability of the appeal under Section 11 of the Passports Act,

1967. Whether the decision so taken is right or not, is not a subject, that can be gone into in the instant proceedings, inasmuch as, any legal remedy thereagainst would be before the appropriate forum. No merit. Dismissed.

A. K. CHAWLA, J

NOVEMBER 10, 2017

rc