

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2044 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-120 Year-2025 Thana- Arwal District- Arwal

=====

Arun Kumar @ Arun Kumar Yadav, Son of Suryadeo Singh, Resident of
Village- Lekha Bigha, P.S- Arwal, District- Arwal.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The Home Secretary, Department of Home, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commission, Magadh Range, Gaya.
4. The District Magistrate, Arwal.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Arwal.
6. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Arwal.
7. The Officer-In-Charge, Arwal, Police Station Arwal.
8. Dharmendra Tiwari, Son of Nagendra Tiwari, Resident of village- Sarwali,
P.S - Karpi, District- Arwal.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Senior Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. S.D. Yadav, A.A.G. 09

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD)

2 18-08-2025 Heard Mr. Ramakant Sharma, learned Senior Counsel

for the petitioner and Mr. S.D. Yadav, learned AAG-09 for the

State of Bihar.

2. The petitioner in the present writ application is
aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the order dated 20.05.2025
passed by the District Magistrate, Arwal by which the petitioner
was asked to make attendance in the office of the
Superintendent of Police, Arwal every Monday and Friday and



to give information with regard to his activities.

3. Learned Senior Counsel submits that the petitioner has got five cases on his head in which he has been chargesheeted. The District Magistrate, Arwal exercised his power under clause (b) sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the Bihar Crime Control Act, 2024. It is pointed out that while passing the impugned order, the District Magistrate directed the petitioner to make his attendance in the office of Superintendent of Police every Monday and Friday but in the name of making of his attendance, he was made to sit in the office for the whole day without maintaining any attendance register or any register taking note of his activities. His submission is that making the petitioner to sit for the whole day amounts to curtailing his personal liberty and the scope of employment which the District Magistrate, Arwal does not consider. It is submitted that in the name of compliance with the order of the District Magistrate, the petitioner has been made to suffer, he has been harassed and he has reasons to believe that in future also, he may be subjected to such orders and harassment.

4. Mr. S.D. Yadav, learned AAG-9 submits that since in this case, the petitioner has already complied with the order which was effective till 30th July, 2025, this writ application has



become infructuous. It is submitted that the grievance of the petitioner as agitated by learned Senior Counsel may only be considered now in an appropriate proceeding, if occasion so arises.

5. Having regard to the submissions noted hereinabove, we are of the considered opinion that so far as the present writ application is concerned, the same has become infructuous. It is being disposed of accordingly, keeping the issues raised by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner open to be considered, if occasion so arises in future.

6. This writ application stands disposed of.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

lekhi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

