

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.465 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-0 Thana- District- Vaishali

Nibha Kumari, Wife of Santosh Kumar, Resident of Village - Mahisaur, P.O.
and P.S. Mahisaur, District - Vaishali, Bihar

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General of Police, Karnataka.
4. The Deputy Inspector General, Muzaffarpur Range, Bihar.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Vaishali, Bihar.
6. The Superintendent of Police, District - Bidar, Karnataka.
7. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Market Police Station, District - Bidar, Karnataka.
8. The Officer-in-charge, Mahisaur Police Station, District - Vaishali, Bihar
9. The Officer-in-charge, Market Police Station, District- Bidar, Karnataka

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Prashant Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. P.N. Sharma, AC to AG
For the Resp Nos. 3, 6, 7 & 9	:	Mr. Ebrahim Kabir, Advocate Ms. Shruti Sinha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD)

10 05-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned AC to

AG for the State of Bihar as also learned counsel for the State of

Karnataka.

2. At this stage, it has transpired that the corpus has

already been located. He has been remanded by a Karnataka Court in

connection with Market PS. Crime No. 04 of 2025 in the District of

Bidar, Karnataka.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has fairly submitted that since the corpus has already been located and he is in remand now by virtue of a judicial order, the prayer made by the petitioner in paragraph 1(i) has become infructuous. It is, however, submitted that the petitioner may be given liberty to raise her other grievances in a duly constituted writ application.

4. Learned counsel for the State of Bihar as well as the State of Karnataka have no objection to the prayer of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. In the circumstances, this writ application is treated as having become infructuous.

6. This Court makes it clear that so far as the reliefs prayed in paragraphs '1(ii)' and '1(iii)' are concerned, this Court has not gone into the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner on merit in this regard. Petitioner is at liberty to raise her grievances and seek suitable relief as may be available to her in a duly constituted writ application.

7. This writ application is disposed of as having become infructuous.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

(Ajit Kumar, J)

lekhi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

