



WP(MD)No.18847 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 29.09.2023

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI**

**WP(MD)No.18847 of 2023**

Ragavan

.. Petitioner

v.

1.The Regional Passport Officer,  
Regional Passport Office,  
Trichy Municipal Water Tank Building,  
W.B.Road,  
Trichy.

2.The Inspector of Police,  
Nagudi Police Station,  
Pudukottai District.

.. Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the first respondent to issue passport to the petitioner based on his application dated 22.03.2023 in File No.TR2065197444123 within a stipulated time limit.



WP(MD)No.18847 of 2023

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Leninkumar

For Respondents : Mr.A.Srinivasan,  
Central Government Standing Counsel  
for R.1

Mr.P.Kottaichamy,  
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)  
for R.2

\*\*\*\*\*

### **ORDER**

The petitioner has applied for passport. While processing the application submitted by the petitioner, the first respondent, on police verification, came to know that the petitioner has involved in a case in Crime No.133 of 2019 on the file of the Nagudi Police Station, for the offence u/s.5, 7(1) of Lotteries Act. Therefore, the first respondent has issued a show cause notice calling upon the petitioner to offer his explanations. The petitioner, apprehending that the passport would not be issued, has filed this writ petition.

2.Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for the Police submitted that the case in Crime No.133 of 2019 was closed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Aranthangi, on 11.08.2023, u/s.468 Cr.P.C.



WEB COPY

3. Pendency of an FIR, by itself, cannot be a ground to refuse the passport. The Passport Authority can refuse the passport and any travel documents under Section 6 of the Passport Act, 1967. Section 6(2)(F) of the Act would be relevant and the same is extracted as under:-

*“6. Refusal of passports, travel documents, etc-*

*...*

*(2) Subject to the other provisions of this Act, the passport authority shall refuse to issue a passport or travel document for visiting any foreign country under clause (c) of sub-section (2) of section 5 on any one or more of the following grounds, and on no other ground, namely -*

*... (f) that proceedings in respect of an offence alleged to have been committed by the applicant are pending before a Criminal Court in India.”*

4. The above provision enables the Passport Authority to refuse the passport or travel document to an applicant on the ground that proceedings in respect of an offence alleged to have been committed by the applicant is pending before a Criminal Court. Registration of an FIR on the police files,



based on a complaint, cannot be construed as a proceedings pending before the Criminal Court.

5.The role of the Court pending the investigation has been discussed by various Courts. In ***W.Jaihar William v. State of Tamil Nadu [2014 (2) CWC 684]***, this Court has held as follows:-

*“8. ... It is well settled legal principle that mere pendency of FIR cannot be construed as pendency of criminal proceedings in respect of the offences alleged to have been committed by the applicant before the Criminal Court. Only after the Court takes cognizance of the offence alleged to have been committed by the applicant, as stipulated under Section 190 of Cr.PC., it can be construed as 'proceedings pending before the Court'”*

6.A Division Bench of this Court in ***Arumugam v. Regional Passport Officer, Madurai [W.A(MD)No.301 of 2018, dated 27.03.2018]***, has held as follows:-

*“8. ... mere pendency of the criminal proceedings cannot be construed as pendency of the criminal proceedings. The decisions relied on for reaching the said conclusion in the above cited decision, would also disclose that unless cognizance is*



*taken by the concerned Magistrate, it does not amount to pendency of the criminal proceedings. Admittedly, in the case on hand, the case is in FIR stage and even for the sake of arguments, subsequently, the charge sheet has been filed, as on the date of submission of the application for passport, only FIR is pending and it cannot be construed as pendency of a criminal case and it cannot be said that the petitioner has suppressed the material fact of pendency of the criminal case.”*

7. In fact, the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, has issued a Circular dated 10.10.2019, wherein, the following instruction was issued:-

*“5. In view of the above, the following instructions may be adopted while processing the passport applications in respect of those applicants who may have criminal proceedings pending before a criminal court in India:*

*... (vi) ... It may be noted that mere filing of FIRs and cases under investigation do not come under the purview of Section 6(2)(f) and that criminal proceedings would only be considered pending against an applicant if a case has been registered before any Court of law and the court has taken cognizance of the same.”*



WP(MD)No.18847 of 2023

Therefore, the Passport Authority is not justified in not deciding the application filed by the petitioner for passport by referring the criminal case.

8.In any event, since there is no case pending as against the petitioner, as on date, this writ petition is allowed with a direction to the Passport Authority to issue passport to this petitioner, by considering his application, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

Index : Yes / No  
NCC : Yes / No  
Internet : Yes  
gk

**29.09.2023**

To

1.The Regional Passport Officer,  
Regional Passport Office,  
Trichy Municipal Water Tank Building,  
W.B.Road,  
Trichy.

2.The Inspector of Police,  
Nagudi Police Station,  
Pudukottai District.



WEB COPY



WP(MD)No.18847 of 2023

**B.PUGALENDHI, J.**

gk

**WP(MD)No.18847 of 2023**

**29.09.2023**