



\$~19

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.M.C. 699/2023**

VASUNDHRA SAWANT

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Santosh Chauriha, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for State
alongwith SI Sudhir P.S. Parliament
Street.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

08.05.2024

CRL. M. A. 2690/2023

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 699/2023

1. By way of the present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C, the petitioner seeks quashing and setting aside the order dated 22.03.2021 passed by MM-06, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi in FIR No. 229/2015 registered under Sections 419/420/120B IPC at P.S. Parliament Street, New Delhi.

2. Vide order dated 22.03.2021, the trial court observed that the offences alleged against the present applicant are punishable under Section 419/420/120B IPC, the request of the applicant/petitioner made before the



trial court seeking NOC for the purpose of renewal of the passport for ten years was declined. However, the trial court has observed that it has no objection if the passport of the accused is so renewed as per rules.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that notification dated 25.08.1993 issued by the Government of India, Ministry of External Affairs is arbitrary and irrelevant which permits the applicant for renewal only for one year. The applicant may require to travel abroad and seek medical opinion for which he would need NOC for a longer duration.

4. Considering that it is not in the domain of this Court to comment upon the arbitrariness of the said notification, the applicant may seek remedy in accordance with law, if so advised.

5. This Court also notes that in support of his submissions only opinion dated 25.06.2022 of MRI and CT Scan report from the Apollo hospital has been placed on record. There is no second opinion of any specialist or hospital placed on record.

6. In view of above discussion, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the order passed by the trial court.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MAY 08, 2024/ssc