

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

(Heard through VC)

CWP No.15439 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 25, 2020

Ranjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Ms. Aishwarya Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner herein is seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to issue a passport to him.
2. The petitioner had applied for passport in the office of respondent No. 2 by application No. 20- 0004061228 dated 5.6.2020. The said application was rejected on the ground that the petitioner has suppressed information regarding the pendency of the FIR against the petitioner that is FIR No. 118 dated 24.06.2018 under Section 61/1/14 of the Excise Act. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the non-disclosure was wholly unintentional as the petitioner was not aware that he had to give information regarding the pendency of FIR against him. It is contended that there is a government notification dated 25.08.1993 wherein

it has been held that persons against whom any criminal case is pending can go abroad after obtaining NOC from the court concerned and therefore, there is no ground for rejection of his application for issuance of a passport. Counsel for the petitioner submits that at the moment he would be satisfied if he is permitted to reapply afresh wherein he would furnish all the necessary details and the same application should be considered in accordance with law.

3. Notice of motion.

4. At this stage, Mr. Karan Kumar Jund, Advocate, who is appearing through the medium of video conferencing, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 and 2 and submits that the application for issuance of passport as filed by the petitioner was devoid of the necessary details regarding the pendency of criminal proceedings and therefore, the application had been rightly rejected.

5. I have heard both the counsel for the parties and perused the pleadings of the case. Without going into the merits of any of the contention as raised by the petitioner, this writ petition is being disposed of by giving a direction to the respondents, that in case the petitioner applies afresh for issuance of passport by giving all the necessary particulars, the application of the petitioner should be considered afresh in accordance with law.

September 25, 2020

vijay saini

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No