



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

122

CRR-1118-2026.

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026.

Vikash Ahlawat

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Varun Veer Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner–Vikash Ahlawat, aged 38 years, has filed the present criminal revision petition impugning the legality of order dated 03.04.2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal (trial Court), whereby the application filed by the petitioner seeking permission and issuance of ‘No Objection Certificate’ for renewal of his Passport, has been partly allowed.

2. Against the petitioner, there is a criminal case i.e. FIR No.224 dated 07.06.2021 registered under Sections 306/34 IPC (Section 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities), Act, 1989, at Police Station Budana, District Karnal, and on joining of investigation, was granted anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 17.11.2021 passed in CRM-M-34436-2021 (Annexure P-1). There is no allegation of misusing the said concession ever till date. During pendency of

proceedings, petitioner moved an application before the trial Court for seeking permission to leave India enabling him to join his services abroad (Singapore). The prayer in the said application was declined. However, on filing of criminal revision petition (CRR-1649-2021), vide order dated 21.05.2024 (Annexure P-2), petitioner-Vikash Ahlawat was granted permission to leave the country for the purpose of earning livelihood. Passport of the petitioner is due to expire, therefore, before its expiry, he moved another application before the trial Court to grant permission to go abroad and for getting renewal of the Passport to issue 'No Objection Certificate'. The application though has been allowed but the period for renewal of the Passport has been limited to one year only.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that considering the services of the petitioner with the company outside the country, he need to visit again and again outside the country and, therefore, ordering for limiting the renewal period of Passport only for one year is too short and, therefore, renewal is required to be extended for a period of *at least* 10 years.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. On being asked by the Court, learned State counsel informs that in fact *challan* had already been submitted on 12.01.2022, however, charges were framed on 04.02.2026 and now the proceedings are fixed for recording of the statements of prosecution witnesses on 03.07.2026. Thus, it is obvious that proceedings have been delayed for several years by the Court itself though may be due to any reason because charges were framed after a period of four years post submission of the *challan*. Therefore, the right of earning of

livelihood of any citizen cannot be taken away by denying him even to travel abroad, for doing so, to meet the object. No such instance has been highlighted by learned State counsel to allege that petitioner ever in the past misused the concession of bail by remaining absent from the Court. The contention of the petitioner has already been noticed before this Court in the order dated 21.05.2026, that petitioner claims to have deep roots in the community as his family i.e. his parents as well as his children are residing in India only.

7. In view of the aforesaid, this Court is of the opinion that petitioner has made out his case for seeking renewal of the Passport for a period of ten years, as has been asked by him in the application before the trial Court.

In view thereof, the **present petition is allowed**. The impugned order dated 03.04.2026 is modified to the extent of renewal period of Passport as observed hereabove. All other conditions, which have been imposed by the trial Court would remain intact and petitioner would be bound by the same.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

29.04.2026
jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/ No