

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**R/SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4624 of 2026****FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:****HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT M. PRACHCHHAK Sd/-**

=====

Approved for Reporting	Yes	No
		No

=====

VINODKUMAR SHREEPRAKASH TOTLA

Versus

UNION OF INDIA

=====

Appearance:

MR BY MANKAD(440) for the Petitioner(s) No. 1

MR SATYAJIT SEN(731) for the Petitioner(s) No. 1

MR PRADIP D BHATE(1523) for the Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT M. PRACHCHHAK**Date : 07/05/2026****ORAL JUDGMENT**

1. **Rule** returnable forthwith. Learned Standing Counsel waives service of notice of rule for and on behalf of the respondent.

2. By way of the present writ petition, filed under Articles 14, 19 and 226 of the Constitution of India r/w the provision of Passport Act, 1967 the petitioner has prayed for direction to renew the passport of the petitioner for period of 10 years.

3. Learned advocate for the petitioner has submitted that under the prevalent rules of the GSR Notification 570(E) dated 25.08.1993, the respondent authority has to renew the passport of the petitioner for a period of 10 years. He has submitted that the petitioner had applied for renewal of the passport, however, the respondent authority has not renewed the passport for 10 years on the ground of FIR against the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner has granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 1.8.2022 passed in Criminal Misc. Application No.3553 of 2021.

4. Mr. Pradip D. Bhate, learned advocate for the respondent submits that the passport application of the petitioner is to be processed in accordance with the GSR Notification 570(E) dated 25.08.1993. He submits that the citizens who are facing criminal proceedings have to produce orders from the Court concerned permitting them to depart from India.

5. Heard learned advocates for the parties, perused the documents on record and considered the submissions.

6. At the outset, it is not in dispute that the application of the petitioner for renewal of the passport is still pending before the concerned respondent authority. Further, from the record it appears that this Court has granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 1.8.2022 passed in Criminal Misc. Application No.3553 of 2021.

7. At this stage, it is appropriate to refer the GSR Notification 570(E) dated 25.08.1993 reads as under:-

“G.S.R 570 (E)-In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of the Section 22 of the Passports Act 1967 (15 of 1967) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of External Affairs No. G.S.R. 298(E), dated the 14th April, 1976, the Central Government, being of the opinion that it is necessary in public interest to do so, hereby exempts citizens of India against whom proceedings in respect of an offences alleged to have been committed by them are pending before a criminal court in India and who produce orders from the court concerned permitting them to depart from India, from the operation of the provisions of Clause (f) of sub-section (2) of Section 6 of the said Act, subject to the following conditions, namely :-

(a) the passport to be issued to every such citizen shall be issued-

(i) for the period specified in order of the court referred to above, if the court specifies a period for which the passport has to be issued; or

(ii) if no period either for the issue of the passport or for the travel abroad is specified in such order, the passport shall be issued or a period one year.

(iii) if such order gives permission to travel abroad for a period less than one year, but does not specify the period validity of the passport, the passport shall be issued for one year; or

(iv) if such order gives permission to travel abroad for a period exceeding one year, and does not specify the validity of the passport, then the passport shall be issued for period of travel abroad specified in the order.

(b) any passport issued in terms of (a) (ii) and (a) (iii) above can be further renewed for one year at a time,

provided the applicant has not travelled abroad for the period sanctioned by the court and provided further that, in the meantime, the order of the court is not cancelled or modified.

(c) any passport issued in terms of (a) (i) above can be further renewed only on the basis of 3 fresh court order specifying a further period of validity of the passport or specifying a period for travel abroad;

(d) the said citizen shall given an undertaking in writing to the passport issuing authority that he shall if required by the court concerned, appear before it at any time during the continuance in force of the passport so issued."

8. Clause (ii) thereof states that if there is no period specified in the order passed by the Trial Court for issuance of passport, the passport shall be issued for a period of 1 year. The said Notification also specifies in Clause (i) that if the Court specifies the period for which the passport has to be issued, then the passport shall be issued for such a specified period.

9. The Division Bench of the Bombay High Court in writ petition No.361 of 2014 dated 13.03.2014 has held thus:-

"10. In the circumstances, we propose to issue guidelines to be followed by the Respondents on receipt of the applications for renewal of the passports, in all cases, where the Magistrate's court has directed that the passports may be renewed as per the Rules.

11. Accordingly, we issue the following directions :-

(a) In all cases where the Magistrates court directs renewal of the passports under the Rules, the Passport Rules, 1980 shall apply and passports other than for a child aged more than 15 years shall be renewed for a

period of ten years or twenty years as the case may be from the date of its issue. All qualifying applicants are entitled to have passport renewed for atleast ten years. The Regional Passport Office shall renew the passports of such qualifying applicants atleast for ten years.

(b) In case where the passports are valid and the applicants hold valid visas on existing passport, the Regional Passport Officer shall issue the additional booklet to the same passport provided the applicant had obtained permission to travel abroad.

(c) If the learned Magistrate passes an order making the reference to the said Notification No. G.S.R. 570(E) dated 26th August, 1993, the passport shall be renewed only for such period that the Magistrate may specify in the order or as otherwise specified in the said Notification where the passport of the applicant is valid for less than one year, the additional booklet may be issued subject to the orders to be obtained in this behalf only of the Magistrate concerned.

12. For avoidance of doubt, we clarify that the guidelines set out herein will be applicable only in the cases where the learned Magistrate ordered renewal of the passports as per Passport Rules, 1980 and to no other. In other cases, where the learned Magistrate had granted permission to the accused persons to depart from India, the provisions of Section 6(2)(f) of the Passports Act, 1967 and the Notification(s) issued thereunder from time to time by the Ministry of External Affairs or such other competent authority so empowered, will continue to apply and directions permitting the accused persons to depart from India and/or the orders permitting renewal of the passports of such accused persons shall continue to be governed by such Notification(s).

10. Though the said decision is not binding on this Court, it has certainly a persuasive value. In the considered opinion of this Court, the ratio of the said judgment squarely applies in the facts and circumstances of the

present case. The Central Government has issued a Notification by exercising powers vested in it under Section 6(2)(f) of the Passport Act, 1967 being GSR Notification 570(E) dated 25.08.1993. There being an ambiguity under the provisions of the Act, the Rules and the GSR Notification 570(E) dated 25.08.1993 issued by the passport authority, the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has clarified the said ambiguity in case of Narendra K. Ambwani (supra). This Court is also of the considered opinion that the passport authorities do not have any authority to decide whether the accused has a right to travel abroad and such authority is only vested in the Trial Court which can impose conditions if an application is made seeking permission to travel abroad. This Court is of the considered opinion that the directions issued by the Bombay High Court are binding upon the passport authorities to renew the passport for a period of 10 years as per the Act and the Rules.

11. In view of the aforesaid reasons and observations, the respondent authority is hereby directed to decide the application of the petitioner for renewal of the passport within period of 4 weeks from the date of receipt of copy of present order and renew the passport of the petitioner for a period of 10 years. However, it is clarified that if the petitioner has to undertake any travel abroad, he will have to make appropriate application to the Trial Court seeking permission to travel abroad, which shall impose such conditions as it deems fit and proper in case of the petitioner.

12. With the aforesaid directions, the present Special Civil Application is allowed and accordingly stands disposed of. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent. No order as to costs. Direct service is permitted.

SURESH SOLANKI

Sd/-
(HEMANT M. PRACHCHAK,J)