



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3332]

FRIDAY, THE 10th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

WRIT PETITION NO: 9932/2026

Between:

1. CHINTAPALLI CHIRANJEEVI,, W/O. SALMAN RAJU, AGED 52 YEARS, R/O 7-34, HARIJANPETA, YANAMADURRU VILLAGE, BHIMARAVARAM MANDAL, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 534239.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, 74B, SOUTH BLOCK, NEW DELHI -110 011.

2. REGIONAL PASSPORT OFFICER, O/O. REGIONAL PASSPORT OFFICE, NEAR P.F. OFFICERR, BESIDE RYTHU BAZAAR, MARRIPALEM VUDA LAY OUT, NAD POST, VISAKHAPATNAM - 530009. ANDHRA PRADESH.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction on the part of the 2nd respondent in considering application for renewal of petitioner's passport bearing No. N6283291 as unjust, arbitrary and violative of Article 21 of Constitution of India and direct the 2nd respondent to process the

petitioner's application dt.14-02-2026 for renewal of the passport bearing No.N6283291

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the 2nd respondent to renew petitioner's passport bearing No. N6283291 forthwith

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.NAQEEB AHMED

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.PARIMI RAMA RAYUDU

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

Aggrieved by the action of the 2nd respondent in not renewing the passport of the petitioner bearing No.N6283291, the present writ petition is filed.

2. Heard Sri Nageeb Ahmed, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Parimi Rama Rayudu, learned Central Government counsel for the respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner while reiterating the contents of the affidavit contended that on the alleged ground of multiple passports, the 2nd respondent is not renewing the passport of petitioner. He further submitted that the passport authorities cannot deny renewal of the passport and the inaction is not justified. Hence, prayed to allow the Writ Petition.

4. On the other hand, learned Central Government Counsel for respondents, on counter, submitted that the authorities declined to consider the application submitted by the petitioner on the ground that without surrendering the previous passport, the petitioner obtained subsequent passport with false particulars and a changed date of birth. He further submitted that pursuant to filing of the writ petition, show cause notice dated 03.06.2026 has been issued to the petitioner, for which she has also submitted an explanation and the respondents would pass

orders on the same, after hearing the petitioner if required. The writ petition is devoid of merits and liable to be dismissed, accordingly, prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner did not dispute the above said submissions, however, sought a direction of this Court to direct the authorities to pass orders on the explanation submitted by the petitioner.

6. Taking their submissions into consideration, this Court, instead of going into the merits and demerits of the matter, with the consent of both the parties, is inclined to dispose of the writ petition directing the authorities to pass appropriate orders pursuant to the explanation submitted by the petitioner as expeditiously as possible.

7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is ***disposed of***. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications, pending if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

Date: 10th July, 2026

RKS