



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

118

CRR-1002-2025

Date of decision: July 09, 2025

PRITPAL SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Manoj K. Srivastava, Advocate (through VC)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Sr. Advocate (ASG) (through VC) with
Mr. Shobhit Phutela, Advocate and
Mr. Vineet Mishra, Advocate
for the respondent-ED.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is assailing the order dated 06.02.2025 (A/1) passed by learned Special Judge, PMLA, SAS Nagar, Mohali, Punjab in case No.CRM/968/2024, whereby the application filed by the petitioner seeking renewal of his passport for a period of 10 years was dismissed as not maintainable.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is engaged in the Education and Immigration Sector for over 17 years, and has, in the past, travelled abroad on 20 occasions without any instance of misuse or violation of travel-related conditions. It is contended that the petitioner is now being unjustifiably deprived of his right to international travel solely on account of proceedings under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA), which themselves rest on a legally tenuous foundation.



3. It has been further urged that the name of the petitioner does not find mention in the chargesheet of the predicate offence registered as FIR No.118/2017, and that after due investigation, the petitioner was placed in column No.2. The core allegations in the predicate offence were dropped, and no application for further investigation or summoning of the petitioner has been moved by the investigating agency in that case. In this backdrop, it is submitted that the pending proceedings under the PMLA, being predicated on the aforesaid FIR, are inherently unsustainable in law.

4. Learned counsel further contends that an earlier application for renewal of passport had been allowed on 10.12.2024, *albeit* only for a period of 1 year, owing to an inadvertent omission on the part of the petitioner in not specifying the desired duration. The present application, it is urged, was moved to seek renewal for the full statutory period of 10 years, which is necessitated by the professional commitments of the petitioner and urgent familial obligations abroad. Denial of such renewal, it is submitted, disproportionately affects the fundamental right of the petitioner to life and livelihood under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

5. On being put to notice, Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Sr. Advocate has appeared on behalf of the respondent-ED and has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. It has been contended that the impugned order suffers from no infirmity. It has still further been argued that the learned trial Court rightly dismissed the second application as not maintainable, considering that the earlier application had already been adjudicated on merits on 10.12.2024. The renewed request, arising from the



same cause, could not have been entertained afresh merely because the petitioner subsequently realized the omission in his prior application.

6. Learned Standing counsel appearing on behalf of the ED has still further submitted that the petitioner is facing a pending prosecution under the PMLA, and in view of the statutory framework, including Gazette Notification No.GSR 570(E) issued by the Central Government, the prayer for long-term renewal of passport was rightly declined. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner's claim of legal unsustainability of PMLA proceedings cannot be the basis for seeking renewal of passport, particularly when the proceedings are subjudice and governed by statutory safeguards.

7. On a pointed query put by the Court, learned counsel for the petitioner has candidly admitted that the earlier application, allowed on 10.12.2024, did not specify the desirability of a 10-year renewal.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material placed on record.

9. It is not in dispute that the earlier application for renewal of passport moved by the petitioner was allowed by the learned trial Court on 10.12.2024, pursuant to which the passport was renewed for a period of one year. Admittedly, the said application did not mention any specific request for 10-year renewal. The present petition, seeking modification/extension of the said relief on grounds now stated to be previously omitted, came to be dismissed on the ground of maintainability.

10. The learned trial Court, in the opinion of this Court, cannot be faulted in law for holding that the second application, filed for the same



subject matter, was not maintainable once the earlier application had been already adjudicated and acted upon. The petitioner had the opportunity to seek full relief in the first instance but failed to do so. Allowing successive applications of this nature would not only undermine judicial finality but also amount to seeking a review of an earlier order in the guise of a fresh application, which is impermissible in law before the same forum.

11. The grounds urged in the present revision petition do not dispute the factual premise forming the basis of the impugned order passed by the learned trial Court. This Court finds no legal or procedural infirmity in the said order warranting interference in revisional jurisdiction.

12. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

July 09, 2025
Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*