



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 18.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Ms. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

W.P.No. 3908 of 2026
&
W.M.P.No. 4330 of 2026

Anas Maideen Razvi

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Regional Passport Officer
Regional Passport Office,
Tiruchirappalli.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Koothanallur Police Station,
Tiruvarur District.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Section 226 of the Constitution of India for issue of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned rejection order, letter ref No.



W.P.No.3908 of 2

OBJ/321191325/25 dated 20.03.2025, issued by the 1st respondent and to quash the same and to consequently to renew passport of the petitioner in application bearing No. TR1075364410123 dated 16.05.2023.

For Petitioner : Mr. P.Vijendran
For Respondent 1: Mr. V.Muthupandi
Standing Counsel
For Respondent 2: Mr. L.Baskaran
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)

ORDER

This writ petition is filed seeking a writ of certiorarified mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned rejection order, letter ref No. OBJ/321191325/25 dated 20.03.2025, issued by the 1st respondent and to quash the same and to consequently to renew passport of the petitioner in application bearing No. TR1075364410123 dated 16.05.2023.



W.P.No.3908 of 2

WEB COPY

2. The petitioner submits that he had applied for renewal of his passport through online in application No.TR1075364410123, to the 1st respondent on 16.05.2023. The 1st respondent refused to renew the passport, due to the pendency of Crl.A.No.4594/2023 before this Court and Crl.M.P.No.4572/2023, on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Mannargudi. Thereafter, the petitioner enquired about the said criminal appeal in the official website of this Court and found that no case was registered as Crl.A.No.4594/2023.

3. In the mean time, Crl.M.P.4572/2023 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Mannargudi was also closed on 15.05.2024. Therefore, he filed W.P.No,24980/2024, before this Court seeking mandamus against the 1st respondent to consider his application. The said writ petition was disposed off on 29.08.2024. This being the fact, the 1st respondent once again rejected his application on 20.03.2025, stating that “*Your police report adverse enquiry in Crl.M.P.No.4572/2023 of Judicial Magistrate, Mannargudi is also pending against the applicant*”. Therefore, the petitioner is before this Court.



W.P.No.3908 of 2

4. The 2nd respondent, the Inspector of Police, Koothanallur

Police Station, Thiruvarur, has filed a status report stating that the petitioner has involved in the following cases:

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Police Station, Crime Number</i>	<i>Stage of Case</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>Koothanallur P.S., Cr.No.1600 of 2020 u/s 294 (b), 324, 506 (ii) IPC @ 294 (b), 324, 506 (ii) IPC</i>	<i>Referred</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>Koothanallur P.S., Cr.No.1140 of 2020 u/s 188, 270, 336 IPC</i>	<i>Referred</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>Koothanallur P.S., Cr.No.214 of 2009 u/s. 294 (b), 341, 506 (ii) IPC</i>	<i>Disposed</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>Koothanallur P.S., Cr.No.43 of 2009 u/s. 107 Cr.P.C</i>	<i>Referred</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>Koothanallur P.S., Cr.No.492 of 2023 u/s., 109, 294 (b), 324, 506 (ii) IPC @ 109, 120 B, 294 (b), 307, 326 506 (ii) IPC</i>	<i>Not taken on file</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>Koothanallur P.S., Cr.No.349 of 2020 u/s. 188, 270, 336 IPC</i>	<i>Referred</i>
<i>7</i>	<i>Koothanallur P.S., Cr.No.213 of 2009 u/s. 302 IPC</i>	<i>Acquitted in SC.No.62 of 2010 by the Learned Sessions Judge, Thiruvarur District.</i> <i>(Appeal Pending)</i> <i>CA.No.649 of 2023 on the file of the Madras High Court.</i>



W.P.No.3908 of 2

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned counsels on either side and perused the records.

6. In a recent judgement, in **2025 INSC 1476 – Mahesh Kumar Agarwal Vs. Union of India**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that denial of passport by quoting the provisions of Section 6 (2) (f) of the Passports Act, was erroneous, since the issue of passport is only a case of providing document for civil identity, whereas travel out of the country was a regulated activity. The right to allow or not to allow the accused person from traveling abroad vests with the Court, in which the criminal proceeding is pending. The Hon'ble Apex Court observed that the issuing authority is bound to issue passport and it does not possess any power to deny the issue of passport itself.

7. In the light of the above, this writ petition is allowed and the rejection order dated 20.03.2025 is quashed. The 1st respondent is directed to renew the passport of the petitioner after following the procedures. Though the petitioner has been acquitted in SC.No.62 of



W.P.No.3908 of 2

2010, on the file of the learned Sessions Judge, Thiruvarur, considering the fact that an appeal has been pending in CA.No.649 of 2023, before this Court, the petitioner has to obtain permission from this Court, before traveling abroad. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

18.02.2026

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No

kan



W.P.No.3908 of 2

To

WEB COPY

1.The Regional Passport Officer
Regional Passport Office,
Tiruchirappalli.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Koothanallur Police Station,
Tiruvarur District.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.3908 of 2

P.T. ASHA, J

kan

W.P.No.3908 of 2026

18.02.2026