

AGK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO.2460 OF 2025  
IN  
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.135 OF 2014**

Sapna Meghsham Redkar @

Sapna Amit Kate

... Applicant

**V/s.**

The State of Maharashtra &

Union of India

... Respondents

ATUL  
GANESH  
KULKARNI

Digitally signed by  
ATUL GANESH  
KULKARNI  
Date: 2025.09.10  
17:13:51 +0530

Mr. Ganesh K Gole with Mr. Ateet Shirodkar, Mr. Bhavin Jain, Kunjan Makwana i/by Mr. Ateet Shirodkar for the applicant.

Mrs. Mahalakshmi Ganapathy, APP for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Sachin Tayade, HC, MRA Marg Police Station, Mumbai, is present.

**CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.**

**DATED : SEPTEMBER 10, 2025**

**P.C.:**

1. The applicant has filed the present interim application seeking permission of this Court as mandated under Notification dated 25 August 1993. The necessity of such permission arises because a criminal revision application challenging the conviction of the applicant is already pending before this Court. Unless such permission is granted, the Passport Authority would not process the application of the applicant for renewal or issuance of a fresh passport.

2. Learned Advocate for the applicant has drawn my attention to earlier precedents of this Court. He referred to the order dated 25 March 2019 passed in Criminal Application No. 139 of 2019, as well as the order dated 25 February 2020 passed in Interim Application No.1 of 2020 in Criminal Revision Application No.135 of 2014. In both these matters, coordinate Benches of this Court had granted similar permission in terms of the said Notification. The learned Advocate further relied upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Petition No. 5490 of 2021, decided on 7 March 2022, wherein it was laid down that while considering an application for fresh passport or renewal, the Passport Authority must keep in view the law declared by this Court in the said judgment.

3. Despite service of notice, none has appeared on behalf of respondent No.2. This indicates that respondent No.2 has chosen not to contest the present application.

4. I have carefully considered the earlier orders passed by coordinate Benches of this Court on 25 March 2019 and 25 February 2020. In both these cases, permission was granted in circumstances similar to the present one. The requirement of obtaining permission under Notification dated 25 August 1993 is essentially procedural. It ensures that pendency of criminal proceedings is brought to the notice of this Court, and it enables the Court to assess whether there is any legal impediment in granting no-objection for renewal of passport. Having regard to the said precedents, and in absence of opposition from the respondents, I find no reason to take a different view. Therefore,

the permission/no-objection as contemplated by Notification dated 25 August 1993 deserves to be granted.

5. However, it is clarified that the grant of such permission by this Court does not, by itself, confer any right upon the applicant to obtain a passport. The Passport Authority shall examine the application of the applicant strictly in accordance with law. While doing so, the Authority shall also keep in view the binding directions issued by the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Petition No. 5490 of 2021 dated 7 March 2022, which lays down the parameters for consideration of such applications.

6. With these observations and directions, the interim application stands disposed of.

**(AMIT BORKAR, J.)**