$~59

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\# **CNR No. DLHC010515792026**

\+ W.P.(C) 15836/2026

PRAVASI LEGAL CELL .....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Neya A. S., Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA .....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY SHARMA

O R D E R

% 28.10.2026

1. The prayer is for quashing of the Office Memorandum dated 10th August, 2026 issued by the respondent. It is urged that the same is arbitrary, non-speaking, unreasonable, and violative of Article 14 and Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

2. It is further urged that in the earlier round of litigation, in W.P.(C) 9892/2026, this Court had directed the respondent to treat the writ petition as a representation and to decide the same. It is urged that the said order dated 22nd July, 2026 passed in W.P.(C)9892/2026 is not complied with in its true letter and spirit.

3. It is further urged that for Non-Resident Indians, the passport renewal fee has been enhanced unreasonably and the same is exorbitant. According to the counsel for the petitioner, a portion of the workforce having the status

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/11/2026 at 11:40:48

of Non-Resident Indian belongs to the weaker section, and in such an eventuality this Court must direct the respondent to reduce the exorbitant increase of 67% in the passport fee to a reasonable one.

4. The learned counsel, in response to the Court's query, states that the economic capacity of a person who is claiming the issuance of a passport or that of renewal of passport can be assessed by evolving a mechanism and, in such an eventuality, the Court can direct the government to reconsider its policy of laying down the passport fee or the renewal fee.

5. We have appreciated the aforesaid submissions.

6. It is not in dispute that the last increase was effected in 2012. The respondent has increased the fee after 14 years. Maybe there is a rise to the extent of 67%, but if such a rise in the quantum is considered for a person who is serving abroad, it cannot be said that there is an unreasonable hike or rise in the passport renewal or passport processing fee.

7. Apart from the above, it is for the respondent/government to decide the policy as regards the fee to be levied. As long as such fee, which is levied towards the renewal of passport or the processing of passport, is not found to be unreasonably exorbitant, the Court is not required to interfere with such policies.

8. Apart from the above, in the matter of financial decisions, where the fee is levied by the government for renewal of passport, it is a settled position of law that the Court should be slow in causing interference.

9. The contention of the counsel for the petitioner that the assessment *qua* the financial conditions of a person serving overseas who intends to have the benefit of renewal of passport or otherwise can be assessed by a mechanism laid down by the government is an issue within the domain of

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/11/2026 at 11:40:48

the government and we cannot direct the same in the absence of there being a statutory provision or constitutional right in favour of such claimants.

10. That being so, in our opinion, the present Public Interest Litigation is devoid of merit and stands dismissed.

NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE, ACJ

SANJAY SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 28, 2026/rk/is

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/11/2026 at 11:40:48