

\$~32

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6979/2018**

SHRI GURPREET SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms Nidhi Mehrotra, Advocate.
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr P. C. Yadav, Senior Panel
Counsel with Ms Neha Gupta,
Advocate for R-1 to R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

09.07.2018

1. Issue notice. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents accepts notice.
2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning an order dated 21.11.2017 passed by the Regional Passport Office, Ministry of External Affairs, Jalandhar, Punjab denying the petitioner's request for a passport on the ground that the petitioner had sought political asylum in Hongkong. Respondent no.3 alleges that the same is against the letter of spirit of the declaration made by the petitioner at the time of applying his passport: "*I owe allegiance to the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India, and have not voluntarily acquired citizenship or travel of any other country. I have not lost, surrendered or been deprived of citizenship of India*"
3. A perusal of the said order indicates that it is pre typed order with blanks – *inter alia* relating to the passport number; name of the applicant; and the country where asylum was sought – which have been filled up in hand. It is apparent that the impugned order is a standard form order, which

is repeatedly issued by the Regional Passport Officer.

4. The question whether a passport can be denied to a citizen of India on the ground as stated in the impugned order has been considered by this Court in a number of decisions. The Division Bench of this Court in the case *Union of India & Anr. v. Satnam Singh: 2018 II AD (DELHI) 73* has also held as under:-

“23. This Court is of the opinion, therefore, that sovereignty and integrity of the country are robust concepts that can withstand the actions of isolated individuals who may seek political asylum; their mere action in so seeking asylum- without more, by way of action tending to undermine the sovereignty, through actions that can result in disorder or violence- cannot be a ground for refusing passport to them.”

5. The impugned order dated 21.11.2017 is, thus, unsustainable. It is, accordingly, set aside. The respondents are directed to ensure that a passport is issued to the petitioner (subject to the petitioner complying with all other requirements) within a period of four weeks from today.

6. It also appears to this Court that repeatedly issuing standard format orders, which are in complete disregard of the orders passed by the Division Bench of this Court would not only amount to acting contrary to law but wilful disobedience of the orders passed by this Court. Respondent nos.1 and 2 are therefore, directed to issue necessary directions to ensure that the orders passed by this Court are duly implemented by its officers.

7. The petition is disposed of with the aforesaid directions

8. Order *dasti*.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 09, 2018/MK