

3rd October,
2023
(AK)
16

W.P.A 17846 of 2023

Sougata Das
Vs.
The Union of India and others

Mr. Biswaranjan Bhakat
Mr. Probal Das

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Asok Kumar Chakrabarti
Mr. Kumar Jyoti Tewari

...for the respondent nos.1 and 2.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's passport has been inactivated unlawfully by the passport authorities on the basis of complaints lodged by the petitioner's wife, the private respondent.
2. It is submitted that although the petitioner satisfied the passport authorities that the petitioner did not have notice of the criminal cases at the juncture when the passport was applied for, the passport authority has still continued with the inactivation on the ground that the criminal cases are pending at Serampore against the petitioner.
3. It is submitted that the same is not a valid ground for such inactivation.

4. Learned Additional Solicitor General, at the outset, takes a point of maintainability of the writ petition on the ground of lack of territorial jurisdiction.

5. The respondent authorities are justified in submitting on such score, since the present writ petition is filed by the petitioner who is a resident of Bengaluru and against the inactivation by the Regional Passport Authority of Bengaluru.

6. As such, this court does not have the territorial jurisdiction to entertain the present writ petition.

7. Accordingly, WPA 17846 of 2023 is rejected for lack of territorial jurisdiction without any order as to costs, with liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate High Court having territorial jurisdiction with the grievance as ventilated herein.

Urgent photostat copies of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)