



\$~10

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10985/2024**

MRS AYESHA SIDDIKA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pramod Kumar & Mr. Jaber
Singh, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC
with Ms. Sumita Shukla, Advocate
for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

22.08.2024

%

1. The Petitioner has filed the present petition seeking directions for impounding of the passport of Respondent No. 3— Mr. Rizwan Ahmad under Sections 10(3)(h) and 10(4) of the Passports Act, 1967.

2. At the outset, it has been pointed out by Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC for Respondent No. 1, that pursuant to the Petitioner's complaint, a show cause notice dated 14th August, 2024 has been issued by the Embassy of India, Doha, Qatar to Respondent No. 3. A copy of the said show cause notice has been handed over across the board, and the same is taken on record. For the sake of ready reference, the show cause notice is reproduced hereunder:

“SHOW CAUSE NOTICE

It has been brought to the notice of the Embassy of India, Doha



that Mr. Rizwan Ahmad, an Indian national, who has been living in Qatar is charged with the offence under Sections 498-A, 323-325 of Indian Penal Code 1860 and Sections 3 & 4 of Dowry prohibition Act, 1961 and is required to immediately appear before the court.

2. *In view of the above and under Section 10, para 3 (h) of the 'Passport Act, 1967', Mr. Rizwan Ahmad is hereby directed to explain in writing to the Embassy of India, Doha, as to why his Passport should not be impounded/revoked.*

3. *In case of failure to submit the explanation by the stipulated date, a decision will be taken as per the Indian Court Order.*

*Sd/-
(Dr. Vaibhav A. Tandale)
First Secretary (Cons.)”*

3. Without going into the question of maintainability of the present petition, on which the Court had expressed reservations on the previous hearing, in light of the fact that Respondents have acted upon the Petitioner's request, in the opinion of the Court, no further directions are necessary in the present petition.

4. It is clarified that the Court has not examined the merits of the case, and all rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

5. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 22, 2024

as