



\$~25

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 3538/2023 AND CM APPL. 13750/2023, CM APPL.
47059/2023, CM APPL. 50727/2023

RAGHVENDRA GOEL

.....Petitioner
Through: Mrs. Prachi Mishra, Mr.
Abhishek Panwar, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondent
Through: Mr Prabhjit Jauhar, Ms
Malvika Kapila Kalra, Ms.
Apoorva Jain Advocates for
respondent no. 4.
Mr. Farman Ali, SPG, Ms.
Usha Jamnal, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR
KAURAV

ORDER
% **19.03.2026**

CM APPL. 47059/2023 & CM APPL. 50727/2023 (delay)

1. For the reasons stated in the application the delay in filing the counter affidavit and rejoinder is condoned.
2. The applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 3538/2023

1. The petition is, primarily, for directions for revocation and



suspension of passport bearing no. W4946997 issued by respondents no. 2 and 3-authorities, in favour of the petitioner's minor child namely Yugvir Goel. Further prayer for restraining respondent no. 4 from leaving the country with the said minor child is also made.

2. As per the case set up by the petitioner, respondent no. 4 is his lawfully wedded wife and has illegally obtained the aforesaid passport in the name of their minor child. Respondent no. 4 is stated to have furnished false documents before respondents no. 2 and 3-authorities in order to bypass the procedural requirements for obtaining a passport in the name of a minor under the Passport Rules, 1980 (Rules).

3. The Court, *vide* order dated 21.03.2023, had directed issuance of notice and restrained respondent no. 4 from taking the minor child outside the country without the permission of the concerned Family Court. Subsequently, it appears that during the pendency of Writ Petition, notice dated 27.03.2023 (SCN) was issued to the respondent no. 4 to show cause as to why the said passport should not be revoked/impounded under Section 10 (3) of the Passports Act, 1967, by the passport authority.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 4 submits that her reply to the aforesaid notice has been filed. He further submits that there was no concealment of information by her in obtaining the passport. He submits that passports in the name of minor children may be applied for by one of the parents, even without the involvement of the other. According to him, the petitioner is relying on subsequent events, which do not have any bearing on her application for a



passport in the name of the minor child. Additionally, he submits that the application was complete in all respects and the prayers in the petition are completely uncalled for.

4. The court, however, at this stage is not considering the larger legal issue as to whether unilaterally one of the parents can apply for passport. At present, the Court is concerned with the submissions of the petitioner regarding the alleged concealment of material information by respondent no. 4. The said aspect has to be looked into by the concerned authority. Considering that the concerned authorities have already directed respondent no. 4 to reply to the aforesaid allegations of the petitioner, the said grievance of the petitioner has necessarily to be adjudicated.

5. The passport authority is therefore, directed to take the issue to its logical conclusion after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and respondent no. 4.

6. All rights and contentions of both the parties are left open.

7. Accordingly, the present petition, along with all pending applications, stands disposed of. Pending application also stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 19, 2026/ar