

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2388 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-101 Year-2025 Thana- JAKKANPUR District- Patna

Amjad Ali @ Pintu @ Pintu Alam, S/o Barkat Miyan, Resident of village-
Lashkar, P.S.- Shahpur, Dist.- Bhojpur, 802165, currently residing at New
Bagrahpur, Mithapur, Patna, Bihar 800001

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Additional Chief Secretary, Dept. of Home Affairs, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna
4. The Superintendent of Police, Patna.
5. The Station House Officer, Jakkanpur Police Station, Patna
6. Nishu Kumari W/o Amjad Ali @ Pintu Alam, D/o Sanjiv Kumar Resident of village- Ladma, P.O.- Maheshamunda, P.S.- Kahalgaon, District - Bhagalpur-813203.
7. Sanjiv Kumar S/O Late Saligram Yadav Resident of village- Ladma, P.O.- Maheshamunda, P.S.- Kahalgaon, District - Bhagalpur-813203.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Jay Karan, Advocate Mr. Masoon Raza, Advocate Ms. Shruti Singh, Advocate
For the Respondents	:	Mr. P.N. Sharma, AC to AG

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

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD)

2 10-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
AC to AG for the State.

2. This writ application has been preferred seeking the
following reliefs:-

“A. For Writ/Writ(s), order/Order(s),
direction/direction(s), directing the



respondent authorities to produce the victim woman namely Nishu Kumari, W/o Amjad Ali @ Pintu Alam, D/o- Sanjiv Kumar, resident of village- Ladma, P.O.- Maheshamunda, P.S.- Kahalgaon, District- Bhagalpur before this Hon'ble Court in the light of the fact that the victim girl has requested the petitioner to get a complaint lodged in respect of her dire conditions surrounding her and she has been under fear of any unwarranted accident which may be committed to her;

B. For grant of any other incidental, consequential or other relief/reliefs, to which the petitioner is found entitled in the eye of law.”

3. It is the case of the petitioner that he married to the victim lady in accordance with Hindu rites, rituals and ceremonies. They were known to each other since May 2022.

4. It appears on perusal of the records that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court for the identical relief in Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 510 of 2025. A learned Division Bench of this Court had issued notice to the respondents and also interacted with the respondent no. 7 (corpus) at the relevant time. In course of interaction, the corpus Nishu Kumari aged about 25 years specifically stated that she was not interested in going with the petitioner and she wanted to



go with her parents. The corpus had also disclosed before the Court that she had not been illegally detained by Respondent No. 6 or her parents, as alleged by the petitioner.

5. After taking note of the statements of the corpus, the learned Division Bench of this Court dismissed the writ petition.

6. Now, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he got a letter on the Instagram in which the corpus has disclosed that she was compelled to make a statement in the High Court but at this stage, she has been confined by her parents and she is not being allowed to go outside her house.

7. Learned counsel submits that in this regard, the petitioner has lodged a complaint with the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna but no action has been taken thereon.

8. Learned AC to AG for the State submits that this writ application is liable to be dismissed *in limine*. It is his submission that this Court sitting under Article 226 of the Constitution of India would not go on making a fishing inquiry at each and every stage. The earlier Hon'ble Division Bench had already interacted with the corpus who is aged about 25 years. It is difficult to understand that if she can put a letter on the



Instagram for the petitioner, why she cannot make a complaint in this regard through digital mode/electronic mode to the police or any other competent authority by way of a complaint.

9. Having regard to the submissions noted hereinabove, we are of the considered opinion that once the writ petition has been dismissed after notice and interaction with the corpus, it is not appropriate to once again entertain this writ application on the basis of a so-called letter sent on the Instagram as being claimed by the petitioner.

10. We decline to entertain the writ application. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to apply for any other remedy in accordance with law.

11. This writ application is dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

lekhi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

