

\$~68

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5359/2018**

DOLKAR KALSANG

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Simarpal Singh Sawhni with Mr.
Sidhant Krishan Singh, Advs.

versus

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Gigi C. George, Adv. for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

18.05.2018

%

CM. APPL. No.20719/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.5359/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Ms. George accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. In view of the order that I propose to pass, learned counsel for the official respondents says that he does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

4. In this writ petition, the following substantive reliefs have been sought:

“a) Issue an appropriate writ of mandamus or any other writ, order or direction to the respondent No.1 to decide the appeal of the petitioner i.e. Appeal No.12 of 2018 titled as “Dolkar Kalsang vs. Regional Passport Office, Bengaluru in a time bound manner or in alternative;

b) Issue an appropriate writ of certiorari and quash/set aside order(s) dated 19.04.2013 bearing no.(s) – RVK/300526015/13, 1200220_POL_BNG passed by respondent No.1 by which the passport of the petitioner was revoked.”

5. As would be evident, the petitioner's principal grievance is that his appeal has not been decided till date by respondent No.1. A perusal of Annexure-14 at page 104 of the paper book would show that the petitioner's appeal was received by the concerned authority on 8.2.2018.
6. In these circumstances, respondent No.1 is directed to dispose of the appeal of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible, though, not later than six weeks from the receipt of this order.
7. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 18, 2018/pmc