

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104

2024:PHHC:015006
CWP No.1272 of 2024
Date of Decision:05.02.2024

Priya

....Petitioner

VS.

Union of India and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr.Vishal Raj Sehijpal, Advocate
Mr. Anwar Ahmad Khan, Advocate
Mr. Prushender Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Amit Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel
for respondents No. 1 and 2

Ms. Shweta Nahata, Advocate, for respondent No. 3

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents No. 1 and 2 to issue her passport.
2. Counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that petitioner was adopted by her aunt who is staying in Austria. The adoption deed was executed in 2006 and since then the petitioner is residing in India though her aunt is staying in Austria. The petitioner has applied for passport and respondents are insisting for NOC from respondent No. 3 which is not applicable because petitioner is major and she has even solemnized marriage.

3. Mr. Amit Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel for Union of India submits that petitioner may be directed to appear before the passport authority alongwith requisite documents. Thereafter, the passport authority would pass an appropriate order within six weeks.

4. Counsel for the petitioner agrees with the aforesaid arrangement.

5. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petition stands disposed of with a direction to petitioner to appear before the passport authority on 27.02.2024 alongwith requisite documents. On doing so, the passport authority would pass an appropriate order within six weeks from 27.02.2024.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

05.02.2024
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No