



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**25 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1192 OF 2025
IN APEAL/146/2012**

RAVINDRA RANGNATH AVHAD

....Applicant

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

Mr. N. B. Narwad, Advocate for the applicant
Mr. U. B. Bondar, Advocate for the respondent No. 2
Mr. K. S. Patil, APP for the respondents/State

CORAM : ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.

DATE : 24th NOVEMBER, 2025

PER COURT :

1. The applicant is challenging the order dated 11-03-2025 passed by the respondent No.2- the Regional Passport Office, Pune, which rejected the application filed by the applicant for issuance of the passport to visit the Netherlands, as his daughter is residing there.
2. Heard the learned advocate for both parties. Perused the impugned order and record.
3. At the outset, it appears that as the applicant has suppressed the facts of the conviction passed against him, the application was rejected.

4. The learned advocate for the applicant submitted that the applicant was not aware of the filling of the application form, but the agent had filled the form. He fairly agreed that the fault was on his part. Therefore, he urged that the order be set aside and that he be permitted to file a fresh application before the authority.

5. In response to that, the learned advocate for the respondent No. 2 opposed the application and contended that the order passed by the learned authority is just and proper and therefore, no interference is required.

6. On perusal of the record, it appears that the applicant was convicted in Special (ACB) Case No.2/2005 for the offences punishable under Sections 7, 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, and sentenced to suffer imprisonment. However, the sentence is suspended till final disposal of the appeal, and the appeal was admitted by this court on 07-03-2012. Thus, it seems that the matter is sub judice before this court. It is pertinent to note that the applicant shall clearly state the facts in the application before the authority. However, he failed to disclose the said facts, and the authorities have therefore rejected his application. Hence, I do not find any illegality or perversity in the said order, as it was incumbent on the applicant to mention the correct facts before the authority instead of suppressing the same.

7. However, having considered the submissions and the fact that the applicant wants to visit the Netherlands to meet his daughter, I deemed it appropriate to quash and set aside the impugned order by giving an opportunity to the applicant to file a fresh application before the authority discloses all the correct facts.

8. As a result, the criminal application is partly allowed. The order dated 11-03-2025 passed by the respondent No. 2, the Regional Passport Office, is hereby quashed and set aside.

9. Needless to clarify that the applicant is permitted to file a fresh application for the issuance of a passport before the authority. The authority will consider the said application in accordance with the law.

[ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.]