

**218 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.3328 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 22.04.2019.

Jatinder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Sidhu, Advocate,
for the respondents.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The petitioner seeks quashing of order dated 08.11.2017 (Annexure P-3) passed by respondent No.2 vide which passport of the petitioner has been cancelled.

The passport in question has been declined on the ground that the petitioner suppressed the information regarding all the passports issued to him by the authorities. As per the record, the petitioner has been issued four passports. Initially, the petitioner was issued passport No. A-9080866 on 07.10.2005, later on he was issued passport No. F-3923006 dated 30.06.2005, J-3670300 dated 28.10.2010 and P-1107870 dated 21.06.2016 as reflected in the reply.

There is no mention of passport No. F-3923006 dated 30.06.2005 in the application. During the course of the arguments, the learned counsel for the respondents has also made a statement that the

conduct of the petitioner is in violation of the declaration made under

the Passports Act, 1967. However, the contents of the same are not on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that there is no intention to conceal any information/document from the respondents. In fact, as the Passport had been lost, therefore, the reference of the same could not be made and the same being a *bona fide* mistake could not be reflected.

In view of above, it is ordered that in case the petitioner makes a fresh application as per law with complete details, the same be considered and decided by the respondents expeditiously preferably within eight weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the judgment. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

Disposed of.

22.04.2019.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No