

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.99 of 2017

=====

Chandradeo Sharma @ Panjabi Sharma, Son of Bechan Sharma,
Resident of Village- Rampur Garikhana, P.O.- Khagaul, P.S.- Khagaul,
District- Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director General of Police,
Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna.
3. The Superintendent of Police (Rural), Patna.
4. The Superintendent of Police (City), Patna.
5. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Danapur, District- Patna.
6. The Sub Divisional Police Officer, Danapur, Patna.
7. The Station House Officer (SHO), Khagaul Police Station, Khagaul,
Patna.
8. The Investigating Officer, Khagaul Police Station Case No. 041/2016,
P.S. - Khagaul, District- Patna.
9. Dharmajit Kumar, Son of Shri Suresh Sharma, Resident of Village-
Paliganj, New Masjid, P.S.- Paliganj, District- Patna.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Pandey Sanjay Sahay,
Mr. Rajesh Ranjan, Advocates

For the Respondents : Mr. P. K. Verma, AAG3
Dr. Mankeshwar Tiwari, AC to AAG 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH

And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH)

4 21-02-2017 This habeas corpus application was filed by the father in

relation to his minor daughter, who was allegedly kidnapped. We

had passed certain directions earlier to show that the police was

not taking any step for her recovery. It seems that pursuant to our

observations, police did act and the girl was recovered. Her

statement under Section 164 Cr. P.C. was recorded, wherein she has

stated that she was married and also has a child. She stated that she



is major. That being so, as she desired to go with her husband, she was allowed to go.

2. In view of this counter affidavit, learned counsel for the petitioner though states that the girl in fact is a minor but as she has already married and has a child, he chooses not to press this application. This application is thus permitted to be withdrawn.

3. In view of the aforesaid facts, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this application but submits that the parents of the girl be permitted to meet the girl as and when they desire. It is for the parties to consider the request, keeping in mind that after all, the petitioner remains the girl's father and this relationship cannot be severed.

4. The application is accordingly dismissed as not pressed.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J)

B.T/Ibrar

(Vikash Jain, J)

U		T	
---	--	---	--

