



2026:UHC:4224-DB

SL · N o.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			HABC No.16 of 2026 <u>Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J.</u> <u>Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J.</u> Ms. Tanupriya Joshi, Advocate for the petitioner. 2. Mr. J. S. Virk, learned Additional Advocate General assisted by Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. It is habeas corpus petition filed by the petitioner (father) seeking corpus of his daughter, which according to the petitioner, has illegally been detained by respondent nos.4, 5 and 6. 4. Heard and perused the record. 5. The case of the petitioner is that the corpus was last seen in the house of the petitioner on the intervening night on 21/22.02.2026, but early in the morning on 22.02.2026, she was not found in the house. A search was made, but she could not be traced; therefore, a missing report was filed at Shyampur Police Station. 6. Subsequently, the petitioner came to know that the first petition, Writ Civil No.10944 of 2026, Khusboo Saini & Another vs. State of U.P. and 3 Others, was filed by the corpus along with respondent no.4 before the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad. In the first petition, the corpus introduced herself as Khusboo Saini stating that she had converted her religion and was residing with respondent no.4. 7. In the first petition, the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad provided them protection with certain conditions, but the case of the petitioner is that the



		respondent no.4 as well as corpus is not appearing in the first petition; she has been detained by respondent nos.4, 5 and 6 forcibly. 8. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the corpus has forcibly been detained by respondent nos.4, 5 and 6. Although, the first petition was filed by the corpus seeking protection, which was granted to her subject to certain conditions, thereafter, she has not been appearing in the matter. 9. It is also argued that in the first petition, the petitioner is appearing for respondent no.4 before the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad. 10. Since the corpus herself had sought protection before the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad in the first petition, which according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, is still pending. In the first petition, it is the case of the petitioner that he has been arrayed as respondent no.4. Admittedly, the corpus and respondent no.4 have been provided protection in the first petition by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, therefore, this Court cannot intervene in this matter. If petitioner is aggrieved by any act of respondent no.4, he is free to approach the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad in the first petition. 11. In view of above, the present petition stands disposed of. (Siddhartha Sah, J.) (Ravindra Maithani, J.) 27.05.2026 Akash AKASH
--	--	---