



151 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-20096-2025
Date of decision: 09.04.2025

LOVE SHARMA ALIAS LOVE VERMA

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Gagandeep Jammu, Advocate;
 Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate and
 Ms. Yukta, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of order dated 15.02.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar (Annexure P-11) whereby, the petitioner has been granted the permission to go abroad but request for renewal of his passport has been declined and the order dated 17.03.2025 (Annexure P-15), whereby the application filed by the petitioner has been adjourned.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that earlier, the petitioner sought permission to go abroad and he was permitted to go abroad, subject to furnishing a fix deposit of Rs.5 lakhs vide order dated 15.03.2022 (Annexure P-4). Thereafter, the petitioner went abroad and returned within the stipulated period and appeared before the trial Court and also encashed the fixed deposit, in compliance of the order dated 24.03.2022 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned trial Court. He submits that the petitioner has again sought permission to go abroad along with renewal of his passport, however, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide order dated



15.02.2025 (Annexure P-11), allowed the petitioner to go abroad but declined the prayer with regard to renewal of his passport by observing that the passport is valid till 12.05.2025. Learned counsel further submits that in order to travel abroad, the passport expiry date should be at least six months from the date of departure, as such, the petitioner is not able to go abroad. Furthermore, the petitioner again approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar seeking permission to go abroad and also to seek renewal of his passport, which is going to expire on 12.05.2025, however, the application was adjourned. Lastly, he submits that the petitioner has already executed one agreement (Annexure P-6) for expanding his business and for that purpose, he has to travel abroad and in case, the prayer made by the petitioner is not allowed, he will suffer irreparable loss and the right to travel abroad is a part of his fundamental right as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India as laid down in ***Mrs. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India and Another (1978) 1 SCC 248.***

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab puts in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and submits that he has no objection, in case, a direction be issued to learned Court below for expeditious disposal of the application filed by the petitioner, which is now fixed for 17.04.2025.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusal of the record, it transpires that earlier, when the petitioner was granted the permission to go abroad, he returned within the stipulated time. Further, vide order dated 15.02.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar



(Annexure P-11), the petitioner has already been granted the permission to travel abroad, however, request for renewal of his passport has been declined. Furthermore, a delicate balance must be struck between the rights of the accused and the victim. Justice and compassion are mutually inclusive. While accountability and fairness are integral facets of justice, the idea of just justice can only be realised through compassion. However, the said purpose cannot be achieved if justice is dispensed only on the anvil of accountability in a mechanical manner, devoid of context and nuance.

6. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***M. Viswanathan v. M/s. S.K. Tiles & Potteries P. Ltd. & Ors 2010 (4) SCC (Cri) 298***, while discussing the scope of Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has observed that the inherent powers of the High Court can be exercised to secure the ends of justice and rectify any wrongs that have crept in course of administration of justice. Speaking through Justice Dr. Arijit Pasayat, the following was held:

“14. Exercise of power under section 482 of the Code in a case of this nature is the exception and not the rule. The Section does not confer any new powers on the High Court. It only saves the inherent power which the Court possessed before the enactment of the Code. It envisages three circumstances under which the inherent jurisdiction may be exercised, namely, (i) to give effect to an order under the Code, (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of court, and (iii) to otherwise secure the ends of justice. It is neither possible nor desirable to lay down any inflexible rule which would govern the exercise of inherent jurisdiction. No legislative enactment dealing with procedure can provide for all cases that may possibly arise. Courts, therefore, have inherent powers apart from express provisions of law which are necessary for proper discharge of functions and duties imposed upon them by law. That is the doctrine which finds expression in the section which



merely recognizes and preserves inherent powers of the High Courts. All courts, whether civil or criminal possess, in the absence of any express provision, as inherent in their constitution, all such powers as are necessary to do the right and to undo a wrong in course of administration of justice on the principle "quando lex aliquid alicui concedit, concedere videtur et id sine quo res ipsae esse non potest" (when the law gives a person anything it gives him that without which it cannot exist). While exercising powers under the section, the court does not function as a court of appeal or revision. Inherent jurisdiction under the section though wide has to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the section itself. It is to be exercised ex debito justitiae to do real and substantial justice for the administration of which alone courts exist. Authority of the court exists for advancement of justice and if any attempt is made to abuse that authority so as to produce injustice, the court has power to prevent abuse. It would be an abuse of process of the court to allow any action which would result in injustice and prevent promotion of justice. In exercise of the powers court would be justified to quash any proceeding if it finds that initiation/continuance of it amounts to abuse of the process of court or quashing of these proceedings would otherwise serve the ends of justice”

7. The Hon’ble Supreme Court was confronted with a similar factual matrix in the case of ***Parvez Noordin Lokhandwalla Vs. State of Maharashtra and another (supra)***, wherein speaking through Justice Dr. D.Y. Chandrachud, the following was observed:

“21. ...It would suffice to note that the co-accused was granted bail by the Sessions Judge Thane on 16 April 2018. We are called upon to decide only whether the appellant should be permitted to



travel to the US for eight weeks. In evaluating this issue, we must have regard to the nature of the allegations, the conduct of the appellant and above all, the need to ensure that he does not pose a risk of evading the prosecution. The details which have been furnished to the Court by the appellant, indicate that he has regularly travelled between the US and India on as many as sixteen occasions between 2015 and 2020. He has maintained a close contact with India. The view of the High Court that he has no contact with India is contrary to the material on record. The lodging of an FIR should not in the facts of the present case be a bar on the travel of the appellant to the US for eight weeks to attend to the business of revalidating his Green Card. The conditions which a court imposes for the grant of bail - in this case temporary bail - have to balance the public interest in the enforcement of criminal justice with the rights of the accused. The human right to dignity and the protection of constitutional safeguards should not become illusory by the imposition of conditions which are disproportionate to the need to secure the presence of the accused, the proper course of investigation and eventually to ensure a fair trial. The conditions which are imposed by the court must bear a proportional relationship to the purpose of imposing the conditions. The nature of the risk which is posed by the grant of permission as sought in this case must be carefully evaluated in each case.

xxx xxx xxx

24. Having regard to the genesis of the dispute as well as the issue as to whether the appellant is likely to flee from justice if he were to be permitted to travel to the US, we find, on the basis of the previous record of the appellant, that there is no reason or justification to deny him the permission which has been sought to travel to the US for eight weeks. The appellant is an Indian citizen and holds an Indian passport. While it is true that an FIR has been lodged against the appellant, that, in our view, should



not in itself prevent him from travelling to the US, where he is a resident since 1985, particularly when it has been drawn to the attention of the High Court and this Court that serious consequences would ensue in terms of the invalidation of the Green Card if the appellant were not permitted to travel. The record indicates the large amount of litigation between the family of the appellant and the complainant. Notwithstanding or perhaps because of this, the appellant has frequently travelled between the US and India even after the filing of the complaint and the FIR. We accordingly are of the view that the application for modification was incorrectly rejected by the High Court and the appellant ought to have been allowed to travel to the US for a period of eight weeks... ”

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India gave constitutional status to the right of travelling abroad in the landmark judgment of ***Mrs. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (supra)***. Travelling being one of the most fundamental manifestations of liberty was brought to the fore. This principle was again reiterated in the judgement titled ***Satish Chandra Verma v. Union of India and others, reported as 2019 (2) SCT 741***, wherein highlighting that the right to travel abroad is an important basic human right, the following was observed:

"5. The right to travel abroad is an important basic human right for it nourishes independent and self- determining creative character of the individual, not only by extending his freedoms of action, but also by extending the scope of his experience. The right also extends to private life; marriage, family and friendship are humanities which can be rarely affected through refusal of freedom to go abroad and clearly show that this freedom is a genuine human right. (See Mrs. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India and Another (1978) 1 SCC 248).



*In the said judgement, there is a reference to the words of Justice Douglas in **Kent v. Dulles [1958] 357 US 116** which are as follows:*

"Freedom to go abroad has much social value and represents the basic human right of great significance."

9. In the present case, the petitioner is not likely to flee from justice. He is an Indian citizen and holds an Indian passport. If he is not allowed to travel, it would have a truly detrimental effect with respect to his business.
10. Keeping in view the aforementioned discussion, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar to decide the application filed by the petitioner, within a period of one week, in case, the petitioner files an appropriate application seeking pre-ponement of the main case.
11. However, nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

April 09, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |