



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.09.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

Anandaraj

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Regional Passport Officer,
Regional Passport Office,
Tiruchirapalli,
New Municipal Complex,
Thillai Nagar 7th Cross,
Tiruchirappalli-620 018.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Alangudi Police Station,
Alanguidi,
Pudukkottai District.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the first respondent to re-issue a Passport to the petitioner by processing his application in file No.TR1075306397723 based on his explanation/representation dated 29.08.2023 within a time limit stipulated by this Court.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

For Petitioner	:Mr.E.Balasubramanian
For R1	:Mr.S.Karthick
	Central Government Standing Counsel
For R2	:Mr.P.Kottaichamy
	Government Advocate

ORDER

The petitioner's application for renewal of passport was not considered by the Passport Authority, on the ground that an FIR is pending as against this petitioner.

2. The petitioner was already issued with a passport, however, there was some corrections in the name, for effecting the corrections, the petitioner has submitted an application before the first respondent and filed this writ petitioner that the respondents are not considering the same by referring the criminal case which is pending against him.

3. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the first respondent submitted that on police verification, it is reported that the petitioner is involved in case in Cr.No.26 of 2018 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Alangudi Police Station, therefore, this petitioner was directed to



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

appear for an enquiry along with records, the petitioner without appearing before the first respondent has filed this writ petition for a mandamus directing the first respondent to issue passport to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the second respondent submitted that this petitioner is an accused in Cr.No. 26 of 2018 on the file of the Alangudi Police Station and in that case investigation has already been completed and the final report has also been filed before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Alangudi and the same was not taken on file.

5. 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-

...



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

(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.”

6.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.

7.Similarly, unless and until the Court takes cognizance of the final report filed by the Investigative Agency, it cannot be termed as a proceedings pending before the Criminal Court. ***In Re Narsingh***



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

Das Tapadia v. Goverdhan Das Partani & Another [(2000) 7 SCC

183], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed as follows:-

“8. "Taking cognizance of an offence" by the Court has to be distinguished from the filing of the complaint by the complainant. Taking cognizance would mean the action taken by the court for initiating judicial proceedings against the offender in respect of the offence regarding which the complaint is filed. Before it can be said that any Magistrate or Court has taken cognizance of an offence it must be shown that he has applied his mind to the facts for the purpose of proceeding further in the matter at the instance of the complainant. If the Magistrate or the Court is shown to have applied the mind not for the purpose of taking action upon the complaint but for taking some other kind of action contemplated under the Code Criminal Procedure such as ordering investigation under Section 156(3) or issuing a search warrant, he cannot be said to have taken cognizance of the offence.”

8.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:-



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

WEB COPY

“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. ...”

9. 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.”



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

WEB COPY

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

10. Ordinarily, the duration of a passport as per Rule 12 of the Passport Rules is for a period of 10 years. In the event if the applicant is facing any criminal proceedings, the passport may be issued by restricting the period.

11. Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed with a direction to the Passport Authority to renew the 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.

NCC : Yes / No.

Index : Yes / No.

Internet: Yes

am

12.09.2023



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

To

The Inspector of Police,
Alangudi Police Station,
Alanguidi,
Pudukkottai District.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

am

Order made in
W.P(MD)No.22113 of 2023

12.09.2023