



\$~56

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

+ **LPA 999/2024**

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Appellants

Through: Ms. Pratima N. Lakra, CGSC with Mr. Shailendra Mishra, Ms. Mansi Aggarwal, Mr. Priyam Sharma and Mr. Chanakya, Advocates.

versus

AKSHAR REDDY VANGA AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. C. Mohan Rao, Senior Advocate with Mr. P. Venkat Reddy, Mr. Lokesh Kumar, Mr. Prashant Kr. Tyagi and Mr. P. Srinivas Reddy, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

%

17.12.2025

CM APPL. 79584/2025 (Direction)

1. This is an application moved by the respondents seeking a direction to the appellants to issue Indian Passports.
2. The instant Letters Patent Appeal has been filed challenging the judgment dated 13.03.2024 passed by learned Single Judge whereby the writ petition filed by the respondents was allowed and the prayers made therein were granted. We may note that the prayer made in the writ petition was to declare the action of the appellants in not re-issuing Indian Passport to the respondents, and further cancelling the said Indian Passports as illegal, arbitrary and contrary to the provisions of Citizenship Act, 1955.
3. Learned Single Judge by passing the judgment, which is under challenge



before us in this LPA, observed that the Court did not find any impediment in granting the prayers as sought by the respondents herein.

4. It has now been contended in this application that though there is no stay orders passed by this Court in the instant LPA, the appellants are not processing the application/prayer made by the respondents for issuing the Indian passport. In these circumstances, the direction as prayed for in this application has been sought.

5. We are not inclined to entertain this application for the simple reason that no purpose would be served by reiterating the directions already given by learned Single Judge. It is to be noted that we have not stayed the judgment passed by learned Single Judge and, therefore, in these circumstances the respondent/petitioner ought to take appropriate proceedings for ensuring compliance of the learned Single Judge's judgment.

6. For the said purpose, we have been informed that the respondents have already initiated the contempt proceedings, which are pending before learned Single Judge. Accordingly, in our opinion, the remedy to the respondents is available before the learned Single Judge where the contempt proceedings are pending.

7. For the aforesaid reasons, we decline to accede to the prayers made in this application, which is hereby dismissed.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DECEMBER 17, 2025

yrj