

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA****CWP No.13328 of 2025****Decided on: 24.11.2025**

Manoj Rath

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & others

... Respondents

Coram***Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.*****Whether approved for reporting?¹**

For the petitioner	:	M/s Rajneesh K. Lal and Chetna Thakur, Advocates.
For the respondents	:	Mr. Balram Sharma, Deputy Solicitor General of India, for respondent-UI. Mr. Pushpinder Jaswal, Additional Advocate General, for the respondents-State.

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge (Oral)

The petitioner is aggrieved by Annexure P-1, which is a communication issued by the Regional Passport Office, dated 24.06.2025, on the subject "Clarifications required regarding issuance of Passport Facilities to Shri Manoj Rath", in terms whereof, for the reasons spelled out in the said communication the petitioner has been called upon to provide Court Permission to depart from India.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that presently the case with the Authority is only for renewal of the Passport and the petitioner shall seek appropriate permission from

¹ Whether reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?



the Hon'ble Court concerned once he intends to visit abroad on the strength of the said Passport. However, he submits that as presently the petitioner is not intending to visit abroad, but is only praying for the renewal of his Passport, the condition imposed in this communication of providing necessary Court Permission is totally uncalledfor. Learned Counsel has referred to the judgments of this Court in CWP No.9259 of 2025, titled Vikramaditya Singh Versus Union of India and others, decided on 25.06.2025 and submitted that in similar circumstances, this Court directed the Authorities to pass appropriate orders with regard to the renewal of the Passport without insisting upon the necessary Court permission. He submits that similar order be passed in the present case also.

3. On the other hand, learned Counsel appearing for the Regional Passport Office submits that the insistence of the Court Permission is in terms of the statutory provisions.

4. Having heard learned Counsel for the parties, this Court is of the considered view that as this Court has already earlier held that renewal of Passport is different from visiting abroad on the strength of said Passport, the Authority may go ahead with the consideration of the case of the petitioner for the renewal of the Passport and if there are no other impediments the Passport may be



renewed without insisting upon the condition of the Court Permission to depart from India. It goes without saying that the petitioner shall not leave the Country on the strength of the renewal of the Passport and in case he has to visit abroad after his Passport is renewed then he shall obtain necessary Court Permission before departing from India.

5. With these observations, the petition stands disposed of. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any also stand disposed of accordingly. Let needful be done by the Authority within a period of three weeks from today.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

November 24, 2025
(Rishi)