



WEB COPY

WP No. 47290 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR

WP No. 47290 of 2025

M.Saravanapandiyan

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Passport Officer
Regional Passport Office,
Tiruchirapalli,
New Municipal Complex,
Thillainagar 7th Cross,
Tiruchirapalli-620 018.

2.State Rep. By
The Inspector Of Police,
Poraiyar Ps,
Mayiladuthurai District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

This writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of mandamus directing the 1st respondent to consider the representation sent by the petitioner dated 01.11.2025 to issue a passport to the petitioner within time frame fixed by this Honourable Court

For Petitioner(s): M/s.M.Akbar Basha

For Respondent: Mr. G. Sugadev Rajaguru



CGSC
for R1
Mr.L.Baskaran,
Gov.Adv. (crl.side)

ORDER

The petitioner seeks a direction to the first respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 01.11.2025 and consequently issue a fresh passport to the petitioner.

2. It is the contention of the petitioner that on 19.09.2025, he has applied for issuance of a passport. Thereafter, the first respondent, by communication dated 22.10.2025, sought an explanation regarding the pendency of the criminal case against the petitioner before the second respondent in Crime No.8 of 2024 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 324, 506(ii) of IPC. On 01.11.2025, the petitioner submitted a representation and furnished the explanation sought for. Even thereafter, though the petitioner had submitted all the required documents, and furnished the explanation, no order has been passed on the representation submitted by him. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court.

3. Heard both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

4. By consent of both parties, this writ is taken up for final disposal at the



admission stage itself.

5. At the outset, it is relevant to note that mere pendency of the criminal case, is not a bar for processing the application for issuance of passport. This aspect has been clearly dealt with by a Division Bench of this Court in the case of *The Regional Passport Officer vs. Samsudeen Mohamed Salih and another* made in **W.A.No.902 of 2023 dated 02.06.2023**. The relevant paragraphs of the judgment read as follows:-

" 5. A Division Bench of the Bombay High Court, in the case of Abbas Hatimbhai Kagalwala v. State of Maharashtra and another, 2022 SCC OnLine Bom 1992, to which one of us (S.V.Gangapurwala, CJ.) was a party, has followed the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of Vangala Kasturi Rangacharyulu, supra and directed the respondent therein to process the application of the petitioner for renewal of the passport.

6. The contention of learned counsel for the appellant that the first respondent cannot travel abroad without the permission of the Court where the criminal case is pending, would not be an impediment for the passport authority to consider the application for renewal of the passport. No doubt, if the first respondent has to travel abroad and the criminal case is pending, then unless the Magistrate or the Sessions Court where the criminal case is pending permits the first respondent to travel abroad, he cannot travel abroad."

6. That apart, even when the conviction is recorded, issuance of passport can be refused only in the cases where the applicant is convicted during the



period of five years immediately preceding the date of application for an offence involving moral turpitude and sentenced for imprisonment of not less than two years.

7. In the case of ***Vangala Kasturi Rangacharyulu vs. Central Bureau of Investigation*** made in ***Criminal Appeal No.1342 of 2017 dated 27.09.2021***, though the appellant therein was convicted to undergo one year of imprisonment, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that the passport authority cannot refuse the renewal of the passport on the ground of pendency of the criminal appeal. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as follows:-

"Admittedly, at present, the conviction of the appellant stands still the disposal of the criminal appeal. The sentence which he has to undergo is for a period of one year. The passport authority cannot refuse the renewal of the passport on the ground of pendency of the criminal appeal.

The passport authority is directed to renew the passport of the applicant without raising the objection relating to the pendency of the criminal appeal in this Court. Subject to the other conditions being fulfilled, the Interlocutory Application stands disposed of."

8. Considering the above judgments, I am of the view that mere pendency of the criminal case is not a bar for processing the application for renewal of passport.



9. Accordingly, there shall be a direction to the respondents to consider the application of the petitioner, pending with the respondents for issuance of passport and issue the passport if otherwise, the petitioner satisfies other conditions. Such exercise shall be completed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. It is made clear that if the petitioner wants to travel abroad, he has to obtain necessary permission from the concerned Jurisdiction Magistrate.

10. Accordingly, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

10-12-2025

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes

mrp

To

1. The Passport Officer
Regional Passport Office, Tiruchirapalli,
New Municipal Complex, Thillainagar 7th
Cross, Tiruchirapalli-620 018.

2. The Inspector Of Police, Poraiyar Ps,
Mayiladuthurai District.

3. The Public Prosecutor,



High Court of Madras, Chennai,

WEB COPY

WP No. 47290 of 2025





WEB COPY

WP No. 47290 of 2025



N.SATHISH KUMAR J.

mrp

WP No. 47290 of 2025

10-12-2025