



\$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 3925/2024**

DHARMINDER SINGH BHATIAPetitioner

Through: Mr.Sidak Singh Kalra, Adv.

versus

STATE GOVT.NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC for State

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

09.12.2025

1. Writ Petition under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the BNSS has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner seeking directions to the Passport Authority to renew his Passport for a period of 10 years and release the same to him permanently; and also to modify Order dated 16.11.2013, to the extent that the Petitioner is allowed to leave the State and Country without the permission of the learned Special Court, but only with intimation to the Court.
2. In regard to the renewal of the Petitioner's Passport for the 10 years, learned counsel for the Petitioner has placed reliance on Order dated 06.05.2025 passed in CRL.M.C.3166/2025 titled as *Kaushalya Devi vs. The State of NCT of Delhi and Anr.* and Order dated 26.05.2025 passed in CRL.A.147/2020 titled as *Akash and Anr. vs. State*, wherein the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court has held that the validity period of the Passport is to be governed by the Passport Act and the Passport Rules not by the absence of the Court imposed tenure.
3. Once the NOC has been granted by the learned Trial Court for the renewal of the Passport, the Passport Office must consider the Application, in



accordance with law, without insisting on the Court specified validity period.

4. Learned Trial Court in its impugned Order dated 11.12.2023 has not given any period of renewal of the passport, in the terms of the Judgment of Kaushalya Devi (*supra*). The Passport Authority may consider renewing the Passport, in terms of the Passport Act and the Passport Rules.

5. The second prayer is made for release of the renewed passport to the Petitioner. However, it was a Bail condition imposed vide Order dated 16.11.2013 that the Passport shall be surrendered before the Court.

6. No ground is made out to modify the said Bail condition.

7. The Petitioner has further sought that the Bail Order dated 16.11.2013 be modified to the extent that he may not be required to take prior permission from the learned Special Court and may give intimation to the Court. As has been submitted by learned counsel for the Petitioner, no such Application for the modification of the terms of Bail has been filed by the Petitioner before the learned Trial Court. He is at liberty to move an appropriate Application before the learned Special Judge to seek the modification of the Bail conditions.

8. Petition along with pending Application is accordingly, disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

DECEMBER 9, 2025/rr