



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 19241 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

1. MOIDEEN ZUNAID
S/O ABDUL VAKEEL,
AGE ABOUT 23 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO 5-161/31/21,
PANEER SITE, KOTEKAR,
ULLALA TALUK
D K - 575 022

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HALEEMA AMEEN., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE
BY PANAMBUR POLICE STATION,
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU - 560 001

... RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. C.H. DEVARAJ, AGA)

Digitally signed
by SHWETHA
RAGHAVENDRA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO A) ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE ORDER, DIRECTING THE PANAMBUR POLICE TO NOT TO RESTRICT THE PETITIONER FROM LEAVING THE COUNTRY AND TO ALLOW HIM TO TRAVEL TO OMAN, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RESUMING HIS DUTY OVER THERE, THE ACT OF POLICE WHICH IS IN PURSUANCE TO A CASE REGISTERED AGAINST HIM IN CRIME NO.76/2022 OF PANAMBUR PS, FOR OFFENCES PUNISHABLE U/S 397 OF IPC, AS PER THE FIR-ANNEXURE A, AND CHARGE SHEETED FOR OFFENCE UNDER SECTIONS 392, 397, 307 OF IPC, PENDING ON THE FILE OF VI



ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, MANGALORE, D.K,
IN SC NO. 141/2024 AS PER ANNEXURE-D AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING,
THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. The petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:

- a) *Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate order, directing the Panambur Police to not to restrict the petitioner from leaving the country and to allow him to travel to Oman, for the purpose of resuming his duty over there, the act of police which is in pursuance to a case registered against him in Crime No.76/2022 of Panambur PS, for offences punishable u/s 397 of IPC, as per the FIR- **Annexure A**, and charge sheeted for offence under sections 392, 397, 307 of IPC, pending on the file of VI Additional District and Sessions Judge, Mangalore, D.K, in SC No. 141/2024 as per Annexure-D.*
- b) *Issue direction to the Panambur Police to return the passport of the petitioner which they collected from the petitioner on his arrest.*

2. The petitioner is an accused in Crime No.76/2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 392, 397 and 307 of the Indian Penal Code. Pursuant to the filing of the charge sheet, the proceedings are presently pending before the Court of the VI



Additional District and Sessions Judge, Dakshina
Kannada, Mangaluru, in S.C. No.141/2024.

3. The petitioner was arrested during the course of investigation and was enlarged on bail by the competent Court on 27.02.2023. It is not in dispute that, after being released on bail and subsequent to the filing of the charge sheet, the petitioner left the country and travelled to Oman without obtaining the prior permission of the Trial Court, allegedly for the purpose of securing employment and earning his livelihood. In view of the petitioner's unauthorised departure from the country, the respondent authorities caused a Look Out Circular (LOC) to be issued. The Trial Court also issued a warrant to secure the petitioner's presence.
4. It is further not in dispute that, upon the petitioner's arrival at Calicut on 31.05.2026, the Look Out Circular was executed, pursuant to which he was apprehended and taken into custody. Thereafter, the petitioner filed an application seeking bail in S.C.No.141/2024, which came to be rejected by the Trial Court by order dated 15.06.2026. The petitioner has now approached this Court seeking a direction to the respondents to lift the Look Out



Circular and permit him to travel to Oman to resume his employment.

5. In the considered opinion of this Court, the writ petition is wholly misconceived. The Look Out Circular was issued solely on account of the petitioner having violated the conditions of bail by leaving the country without obtaining the permission of the Trial Court. The object of the Look Out Circular was to secure the petitioner's presence before the competent Court. That object stood fully achieved when the petitioner returned to India, the Look Out Circular was executed and the petitioner was arrested. Thus, the Look Out Circular has exhausted its purpose and, in effect, spent itself upon the petitioner's apprehension.
6. Once the petitioner was taken into custody, it became a matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Trial Court to consider whether he should again be enlarged on bail, particularly in view of the admitted violation of the conditions of the earlier bail order. The Trial Court, upon considering the matter, has already rejected the petitioner's application for bail.



7. In these circumstances, the petitioner cannot invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court seeking a direction permitting him to leave the country. Unless the competent Trial Court enlarges the petitioner on bail and specifically grants permission to travel abroad, the petitioner has no enforceable right to seek such a direction from this Court. The relief sought is therefore legally untenable.
8. Accordingly, no grounds are made out for interference in exercise of the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The writ petition is **dismissed**.
9. In view of the dismissal of the writ petition, all pending interlocutory applications, if any, do not survive for consideration and are accordingly **disposed of**.

SD/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

KTY
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 9