



W.P.(MD)No.3348 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.03.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH

W.P.(MD)No.3348 of 2025

Ragavan

: Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Consulate General of India,
Indian Embassy,
365, Bloor St E No. 700,
Toronto, Ontario,
On M4w 3l4,
Canada.

2. The Regional Passport Officer,
Regional Passport Office,
Tiruchirappalli,
New Municipal Complex,
Thillai Nagar, 7th Cross,
Tiruchirappalli.

3. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Pattukottai Taluk Police Station,
Thanjavur.

: Respondents



W.P.(MD)No.3348 of 2025

PRAYER: Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to consider petitioners application in reference No. 24-2005689490 dated 14.12.2024 to re-issue his passport by adding his spouse name within the time limit.

For Petitioner : Mr.I.Romeo Roy Alfred

For Respondents : Mr.K.Gnanasekaran

Government Advocate for R2

Mr.G.Rajaraman, CGSC for R1

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for issuance of a writ of mandamus, directing the first respondent to re-issue the passport of the petitioner bearing No.N8255866 in Application No.24-2005689490 dated 14.12.2024, by adding the spouse name of the petitioner.

2.The petitioner has made an application for renewal of passport and the application Number is 24-2005689490. While so, on receipt of adverse police verification report, the first respondent has not processed the application. Challenging the same, this Writ Petition is filed.



W.P.(MD)No.3348 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The learned Government Advocate for the second respondent would submit that the matter is still pending in FIR stage and has not resulted in filing a final report.

4. Heard the learned counsels on either side and carefully perused the entire materials available on record.

5. It is a settled proposition of law that a mere pendency of FIR cannot be a bar for consideration of claim for issuance of passport. This Court in the case of *W.Jaihar William Vs State of Tamil Nadu* reported in **2014 (2) CWC 684** has held that mere pendency of FIR cannot be construed as pendency of criminal proceedings, unless Judicial Magistrate takes cognizance of offence, on filing of charge sheet on completion of investigation against the accused. Right to travel abroad is a fundamental right.

6. In view of the same, the first respondent is hereby directed to consider the application of the petitioner dated 14.12.2024, for re-issuance of passport by adding the spouse name of the petitioner, without



W.P.(MD)No.3348 of 2025

WEB COPY

reference to the FIR lodged against him and issue passport, if he is otherwise eligible for the same. The first respondent shall comply with the said direction on merits and in accordance with law within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. With the above directions, this Writ Petition stands allowed. There shall be no order as to costs.

12.03.2025

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

PKN



W.P.(MD)No.3348 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Regional Passport Officer,
Regional Passport Office,
Tiruchirappalli,
New Municipal Complex,
Thillai Nagar, 7th Cross,
Tiruchirappalli.

2. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Pattukottai Taluk Police Station,
Thanjavur.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.3348 of 2025

VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

PKN

W.P.(MD) No.3348 of 2025

12.03.2025