

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105

2024:PHHC:041664
CWP No.7034 of 2024
Date of Decision:22.03.2024

Gurmukh Singh

....Petitioner

VS.

Union of India and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. I.S.Kooner, Advocate
for the petitioner

Ms. Shreyansi Verma, Central Govt. Counsel
for the Union of India

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents No. 2 and 3 to re-issue him passport.
2. The petitioner was issued passport on 10.07.1998 which expired on 09.07.2008. On 25.04.1999, he left for Greece where he lost his passport. He came back to India against passport No. E5450523 which belongs to one Daljeet Singh. The said passport was supplied to him by an agent. He was arrested at IGI Airport, New Delhi on 3.10.2023. He was produced before trial court and awarded sentence of 23 days which he has already undergone. The passport bearing No. E5450523 was seized by police at the time of his arrest. He multiple times applied for passport, however, respondents rejected his application on one or another ground.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Ms. Shreyansi Verma, Central Government Counsel for Union of India, who on advance notice is present in Court, accepts notice and waives service. She 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 eight weeks.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner agrees to the aforesaid arrangement.
6. 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 16.04.2024 alongwith requisite documents. On doing so, the passport authority would pass an appropriate order within six weeks from 16.04.2024. The respondents shall take care of the fact that petitioner travelled from Greece to India on the passport of another person. Had he been in possession of his own passport, there was no reason to travel on the passport of another person. The passport which was in the possession of the petitioner was seized by police and said passport is part of record of trial wherein he was convicted.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

22.03.2024
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No