



W.P.(MD)No.8997 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 22.04.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH

W.P.(MD)No.8997 of 2025

Ananthakumar

: Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Passport Officer,
Regional Passport Office,
Bharathi Ulla Veethi,
Race Course Road,
Madurai.


2. The Superintendent of Police,
Sivagangai District,
Sivagangai.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Thirukoshtiyur Police Station,
Sivagangai District.

4. The Inspector of Police,
Madagupatti Police Station,
Sivagangai District.

: Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent consider the petitioners reply dated on 30.12.2024 and issue passport to



W.P.(MD)No.8997 of 2025

the petitioner based on the petitioner passport file
No.MD5066918611524 dated 09.09.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr. P.Aju Tagore

For Respondents : Mr.R.Senthil Kumar

CGSC for R1

Mr.K.Gunasekaran

Government Advocate (CrI.Side)
for R2 to R4

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for issuance of a writ of mandamus, directing the first respondent to issue the passport to the petitioner in application No.MD5066918611524, dated 09.09.2024, within the time stipulated by this Court.

2.The petitioner submitted an application dated 09.09.2024 to the first respondent seeking for issuance of a passport. While so, on receipt of adverse police verification report, the first respondent had issued a communication dated 24.09.2024, required an explanation from the petitioner. Challenging the same, this Writ Petition is filed.



W.P.(MD)No.8997 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the second respondent would submit that the name of the petitioner has already been removed from the said FIR and as on date, no case is pending against the petitioner.

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 the offence, on filing of charge sheet on completion of investigation against the accused. It is pertinent to state that Right to travel abroad is a “fundamental right”.

6. In view of the aforesaid proposition of law and also taking note of the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.), the first respondent is directed to consider the application of the



W.P.(MD)No.8997 of 2025

WEB COPY

petitioner dated 09.09.2024 and issue passport, if he is otherwise eligible for the same. It is also made clear that 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.

22.04.2025

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

PKN



W.P.(MD)No.8997 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

1. The Passport Officer,
Regional Passport Office,
Bharathi Ulla Veethi,
Race Course Road,
Madurai.
2. The Superintendent of Police,
Sivagangai District,
Sivagangai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Thirukoshtiyur Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Madagupatti Police Station,
Sivagangai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.8997 of 2025

VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

PKN

W.P.(MD) No.8997 of 2025

22.04.2025