



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

WP No. 12783 of 2026

K.Vivekanandan

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Regional Passport Officer
Ministry of External Affairs, Chennai
Royala Towers, No. 2 and 3, IV Floor,
Old No.785 , New No. 158 Anna Salai,
Chennai 02, Tamil Nadu

2.The Inspector of police
Veppur Police station,
Cuddalore district

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, directing the 1st respondent herein to issue passport to the petitioner based on his application File No. MA206711059024 and further on his representation dated 12.11.2024 within a specific time limit as specified by this Honble court

For Petitioner(s): Ms.W.Pamelin

For Respondent: Mr.M.Sathyan for R1
Central Government Standing Counsel
Mr.V.Meghanathan for R2
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner seeks for a direction, directing the 1st respondent herein to issue passport to the petitioner based on his application File No. MA206711059024 and further on his representation dated 12.11.2024.



2. It is the contention of the petitioner that the petitioner applied for passport, however, the first respondent sent a communication that adverse report is sent by the police with regard to the criminal cases are pending in Cr.No.354/2023 on the file of the 2nd respondent under Sections 279 and 304(A) of IPC, therefore, seeks for a direction.

3. Heard both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

4. By consent of both parties, this writ is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

5. At the outset, it is relevant to note that mere pendency of the criminal case, it is not a bar for processing the application for issuance of passport. This aspect has been clearly held by the First Bench of this Court in the case of *The Regional Passport Officer vs. Samsudeen Mohamed Salih and another* made in *W.A.No.902 of 2023* dated 02.06.2023. The relevant paragraph of the judgment reads as follows:-

" 5. A Division Bench of the Bombay High Court, in the case of Abbas Hatimbhai Kagalwala v. State of Maharashtra and another, 2022 SCC OnLine Bom 1992, to which one of us (S.V.Gangapurwala, CJ.) was a party, has followed the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of Vangala Kasturi Rangacharyulu, supra and directed the respondent therein to process the application of the petitioner for renewal of the passport.



WEB COPY

6. *The contention of learned counsel for the appellant that the first respondent cannot travel abroad without the permission of the Court where the criminal case is pending, would not be an impediment for the passport authority to consider the application for renewal of the passport. No doubt, if the first respondent has to travel abroad and the criminal case is pending, then unless the Magistrate or the Sessions Court where the criminal case is pending permits the first respondent to travel abroad, he cannot travel abroad."*

6. It is also apposite to refer to the case of *Vangala Kasturi Rangacharyulu vs. Central Bureau of Investigation* made in *Criminal Appeal No.1342 of 2017* dated 27.09.2021, the appellant therein was convicted to undergo one year of imprisonment, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that the passport authority cannot refuse the renewal of the passport on the ground of pendency of the criminal appeal. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as follows:-

"Admittedly, at present, the conviction of the appellant stands still the disposal of the criminal appeal. The sentence which he has to undergo is for a period of one year. The passport authority cannot refuse the renewal of the passport on the ground of pendency of the criminal appeal.

The passport authority is directed to renew the passport of the applicant without raising the objection relating to the pendency of the criminal appeal in this Court. Subject to the other conditions being fulfilled, the Interlocutory Application stands disposed of."

7. Considering the above judgments, I am of the view that mere pendency of the criminal cases are not a bar for processing the passport. Such view of the matter, there shall be a direction to the first respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner and issue passport if otherwise, the petitioner



satisfies other conditions. Such exercise shall be completed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

06-04-2026

dhk

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WP No. 12783 of 2026



To

1.The Regional Passport Officer
Ministry of External Affairs, Chennai
Royala Towers, No. 2 and 3, IV Floor,
Old No.785 , New No. 158 Anna Salai,
Chennai 02, Tamil Nadu

2.The Inspector of police
Veppur Police station, Cuddalore
district



WEB COPY

WP No. 12783 of 2026



M.DHANDAPANI J.

dhk

WP No. 12783 of 2026

06-04-2026