

\$~48

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

+ W.P.(C) 7434/2018

AMRIK SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Rajiv Gupta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Vikas Mahajan, CGSC with Mr
Vinod Tiwari, GP for R-1 and R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

20.07.2018

CM No.28445/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 7434/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition seeking restoration of his passport facilities. It is stated that the petitioner has been denied the passport facilities on the ground that he had applied for a political asylum in Italy.

3. The petitioner travelled back to India on an emergency certificate issued by the Indian High Commission at Milan. After returning back to India, the petitioner once again applied for passport facilities, which as stated earlier, has been denied. Aggrieved by the denial of such facilities, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the Chief Passport Officer under Section 11 of the Passport Act, 1967. At the material time, the issue whether passport facilities could be denied to a citizen on the ground that

he/she had applied for a political asylum overseas was pending consideration before the Division Bench of this Court in **LPA No.13/2016** captioned as **Union of India and Anr. v. Satnam Singh** and other connect matters. In view of the above, the Chief Passport Officer did not consider the appeal preferred by the petitioner and sent a letter dated 08.05.2017 informing the petitioner that his appeal would be decided after the final decision in the LPA.

4. Since the Division Bench has disposed of the said appeal, the Chief Passport Officer is now required to examine the petitioner's appeal and pass an appropriate order. In view of the above, the concerned Chief Passport Officer is directed to do so within a period of four weeks from today.

5. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 20, 2018

MK