



2026:AHC:203093

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

HABEAS CORPUS WRIT PETITION No. - 779 of 2026

Mohammad Zubair Usman And 3 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Ritesh Mishra, Shailesh Kumar Mishra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: G.A., Om Narayan Mishra, Shitla Prasad Chaubey

AFR

Court No. - 73

HON'BLE SANDEEP JAIN, J.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri NI Jafri learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri Om Narayan Mishra, learned counsel for the respondent no.4.

By order dated 17.08.2026, the petitioner No.1, Mohammad Zubair Usman, was granted temporary custody of the minor corpus from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on every Sunday, as well as during school vacations and holidays. He was also permitted to interact with the minor corpus every day between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. through video conferencing on a mobile phone. By the said order, the petitioner No.1, petitioner No.2/wife, Smt. Wajeehah Wajahat, and the minor corpus were directed to remain personally present before this Court today. In compliance thereof, the petitioner No.1, Mohammad Zubair Usman, petitioner No.2/wife, Smt. Wajeehah Wajahat, and the minor corpus have appeared before the Court.

The petitioner No.1, Mohammad Zubair Usman, submits that when he went to take temporary custody of the minor corpus on a Sunday in terms of the order passed by this Court, a quarrel ensued between him and his in-laws, as a result whereof the custody of the minor corpus was not handed over to him. He further submits that, owing to the aforesaid circumstances, he has not been able to interact freely and meaningfully with the minor corpus. He submits that, being the father of the minor

corpus, he is desirous of having their custody and is capable of providing them with proper care, education, financial security and a suitable environment for their growth and development. According to him, petitioner no. 2 is presently not earning any income and is dependent upon her father, whose income, according to the petitioner No.1, is also limited. The petitioner No.1 has once again expressed his willingness to resume cohabitation with his wife and to discharge his matrimonial as well as parental responsibilities.

The petitioner father was given an opportunity to interact with his minor children before this Court, but the petitioner No.1 could not establish a meaningful interaction with the minor corpus, as they remained in the lap of their mother and maternal grandfather and were apparently comfortable in their company. The elder corpus, Huren Zubair, is aged about seven years, whereas the younger corpus, Noor Zubair, is aged about three years. At such tender ages, the emotional attachment of the children towards the persons with whom they have been continuously residing cannot be overlooked while assessing their present state of mind.

This Court thereafter interacted with petitioner No.2 Smt. Wajeehah Wajahat, wife of the petitioner. She has stated that although she possesses B.Tech. and M.Tech. degrees in Food Technology, she is presently not gainfully employed and is dependent upon her father for her sustenance. She has further stated that, on account of the harassment and cruelty allegedly meted out to her in her matrimonial home, she is presently unwilling to resume cohabitation with the petitioner No.1. At the same time, she has candidly stated that she is professionally qualified and possesses the requisite qualifications and capability to earn her livelihood.

This Court also interacted with the father of the wife/respondent no. 4, namely, Wajahat Ali Khan. He has disclosed that he is running a mobile phone shop and is also engaged in the business of property and real estate. However, despite the opportunity, no documentary material has been placed before this Court to substantiate or establish his actual income or financial capacity. He has further disclosed that his four daughters are still unmarried and are professionally qualified.

This Court made a sincere and concerted endeavour to explore the possibility of reconciliation between the petitioner No.1 and his estranged wife, keeping in view not only the matrimonial relationship between the parties but also the larger interest of the minor corpus, who are at an impressionable age and require the care, affection and emotional support of both parents. However, the endeavour could not bear fruit. The petitioner No.2 Smt. Wajeehah Wajahat has consistently maintained that she was subjected to harassment and cruelty in her matrimonial home and, on that account, has categorically expressed her unwillingness to return to the matrimonial home or resume cohabitation with the petitioner No.1. In the circumstances, this Court finds that no meaningful purpose would be served by compelling the parties to resume matrimonial life against the expressed will of petitioner No.2.

The aforesaid circumstances leave this Court with no option but to examine the question of custody of the minor corpus on its own merits.

The Apex Court in the case of ***Yashita Sahu vs. State of Rajasthan and others (2020) 3 SCC 67***, held that a writ of habeas corpus may be invoked to secure and advance the welfare and best interests of the child. The relevant paragraph is reproduced as under:-

"10. It is too late in the day to urge that a writ of habeas corpus is not maintainable if the child is in the custody of another parent. The law in this regard has developed a lot over a period of time but now it is a settled position that the court can invoke its extraordinary writ jurisdiction for the best interest of the child. This has been done in Elizabeth Dinshaw v. Arvand M. Dinshaw [Elizabeth Dinshaw v. Arvand M. Dinshaw, (1987) 1 SCC 42 : 1987 SCC (Cri) 13] , Nithya Anand Raghavan v. State (NCT of Delhi) [Nithya Anand Raghavan v. State (NCT of Delhi), (2017) 8 SCC 454 : (2017) 4 SCC (Civ) 104] and Lahari Sakhamuri v. Sobhan Kodali [Lahari Sakhamuri v. Sobhan Kodali, (2019) 7 SCC 311 : (2019) 3 SCC (Civ) 590] among others. In all these cases, the writ petitions were entertained. Therefore, we reject the contention of the appellant wife that the writ petition before the High Court of Rajasthan was not maintainable."

The Apex Court in the case of ***Somprabha Rana and others vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and others (2024) 9 SCC 382*** has held that, while

determining the question of custody of a child in a petition seeking a writ of habeas corpus, the paramount consideration is the welfare and best interest of the child. The relevant paragraph of the judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:

"9. After having perused various decisions of this Court, the broad propositions of settled law on the point can be summarised as follows:

9.1. Writ of habeas corpus is a prerogative writ. It is an extraordinary remedy. It is a discretionary remedy;

9.2. The High Court always has the discretion not to exercise the writ jurisdiction depending upon the facts of the case. It all depends on the facts of individual cases;

9.3. Even if the High Court, in a petition of habeas corpus, finds that custody of the child by the respondents was illegal, in a given case, the High Court can decline to exercise jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India if the High Court is of the view that at the stage at which the habeas corpus was sought, it will not be in the welfare and interests of the minor to disturb his/her custody; and

9.4. As far as the decision regarding custody of the minor children is concerned, the only paramount consideration is the welfare of the minor. The parties' rights cannot be allowed to override the child's welfare. This principle also applies to a petition seeking habeas corpus concerning a minor."

This Court, in ***Reshu and Others v. State of U.P. and Others, 2021 SCC OnLine All 1065***, while holding that a writ of habeas corpus may be issued to secure the welfare and best interests of a child, and while interpreting the expression “welfare” and delineating the factors that a Court is required to consider while adjudicating matters relating to the custody of a child in a petition seeking a writ of habeas corpus, held as under:

14. The object and scope of a writ of habeas corpus in the context of a claim relating to custody of a minor child fell for consideration in Nithya Anand Raghvan v. State (NCT of Delhi) (2017) 8 SCC 454, and it was held that the principal duty of the court in such matters is to ascertain whether the custody of the child is unlawful and illegal and whether the welfare of the child requires that his present custody should be changed and the child be handed over to the care and custody of any other person.

15. Taking a similar view in the case of *Syed Saleemuddin v. Dr. Rukhsana* (2001) 5 SCC 247, it was held that in a habeas corpus petition seeking transfer of custody of a child from one parent to the other, the principal consideration for the court would be to ascertain whether the custody of the child can be said to be unlawful or illegal and whether the welfare of the child requires that the present custody should be changed. It was stated thus:—

“11...it is clear that in an application seeking a writ of Habeas Corpus for custody of minor children the principal consideration for the Court is to ascertain whether the custody of the children can be said to be unlawful or illegal and whether the welfare of the children requires that present custody should be changed and the children should be left in care and custody of somebody else. The principle is well settled that in a matter of custody of a child the welfare of the child is of paramount consideration of the Court..”

19. The question as to how the court would determine what is the benefit of the child was considered in *Re : Mc. Grath (infants)* [1983] 1 Ch. 143.CA. and it was observed by Lindley L.J., as follows:—

“...The dominant matter for the consideration of the court is the welfare of the child. But the welfare of a child is not to be measured by money only, nor by physical comfort only. The word welfare must be taken in its widest sense. The moral and religious welfare of the child must be considered as well as its physical well-being. Nor can the ties of affection be disregarded.”

20. The issue as to welfare of the child again arose in *Re O. (an infant)* [1965] 1 Ch.23 CA. where Harman L.J., stated as follows:—

“It is not, I think, really in dispute that in all cases the paramount consideration is the welfare of the child but that, of course, does not mean you add up shillings and pence, or situation or prospects. What you look at is the whole background of the child's life and the first consideration you have to take into account when you are looking at his welfare is; who are his parents and are they ready to do their duty.”

21. The question as to what would be the dominating factors while examining the welfare of a child was considered in *Walker v. Walker & Harrison* 1981 New Ze Recent Law 257, and it was observed that while material considerations have their place, they are secondary matters. More important are stability and security, loving and understanding care and guidance, and warm and compassionate relationships which are essential for the development of the child's character, personality and talents. It was stated as follows:—

“Welfare is an all-encompassing word. It includes material welfare; both in the sense of adequacy of resources to provide a pleasant home and a comfortable standard of living and in the sense of an adequacy of care to ensure that good health and due personal pride are maintained. However, while material considerations have their place they are secondary matters. More important are the stability and the security, the loving and understanding care and guidance, the warm and compassionate relationships that are essential for the full development of the child's own character, personality and talents.”

22. In the context of consideration of an application by a parent seeking custody of a child through the medium of a habeas corpus proceeding, it has been stated in *American Jurisprudence*, 2nd Edn. Vol. 3924 as follows:—

“...An application by a parent, through the medium of a habeas corpus proceeding, for custody of a child is addressed to the discretion of the court, and custody may be withheld from the parent where it is made clearly to appear that by reason of unfitness for the trust or of other sufficient causes the permanent interests of the child would be sacrificed by a change of custody. In determining whether it will be for the best interest of a child to award its custody to the father or mother, the court may properly consult the child, if it has sufficient judgment.”

37. While determining whether father or mother should get the custody of a minor child, in *Thrity Hoshie Dolikuka v. Hoshiam Shavaksha Dolikuka* (1982) 2 SCC 544, it was held that the only consideration for the court in such matters should be the welfare and interest of the minor. It was stated thus:—

“17. The principles of law in relation to the custody of a minor appear to be well-established. It is well-settled that any matter concerning a minor, has to be considered and decided only from the point of view of the welfare and interest of the minor. In

dealing with a matter concerning a minor, the Court has a special responsibility and it is the duty of the Court to consider the welfare of the minor and to protect the minor's interest. In considering the question of custody of a minor, the Court has to be guided by the only consideration of the welfare of the minor.”

38. Further, referring to para 428 of Halsbury's Laws of England, 3rd Edn., Vol. 2129, in *Thrity Hoshie Dolikuka's* case, it was observed as follows:—

“18. In Halsbury's Laws of England, 3rd Edn., Vol. 21, the law is succinctly stated in para 428 at pp. 193-94 in the following terms:

“428. *Infant's welfare paramount.*- In any proceedings before any court, concerning the custody or upbringing of an infant or the administration of any property belonging to or held on trust for an infant or the application of the income thereof, the court must regard the welfare of the infant as the first and paramount consideration, and must not take into consideration, whether from any other point of view, the claim of the father, or any right at common law possessed by the father in respect of such custody, upbringing, administration or application is superior to that of the mother, or the claim of the mother is superior to that of the father. This provision applies whether both parents are living or either or both is or are dead.

Even where the infant is a foreign national, the court, while giving weight to the views of the foreign court, is bound to treat the welfare of the infant as being of the first and paramount consideration whatever orders may have been made by the courts of any other country.”

39. Examining the factors to be considered in matters relating to custody of a minor child, in *Mausami Moitra Ganguli v. Jayant Ganguli* (2008) 7 SCC 673, it was held that better financial resources, love for child, or statutory rights are no doubt relevant but welfare of the child would be paramount. It was observed as follows:—

“19. The principles of law in relation to the custody of a minor child are well settled. It is trite that while determining the question as to which parent the care and control of a child should be committed, the first and the paramount consideration is the welfare and interest of the child and not the rights of the parents under a statute. Indubitably, the provisions of law pertaining to the custody of a child contained in

either the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 (Section 17) or the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956 (Section 13) also hold out the welfare of the child as a predominant consideration. In fact, no statute, on the subject, can ignore, eschew or obliterate the vital factor of the welfare of the minor.

20. The question of welfare of the minor child has again to be considered in the background of the relevant facts and circumstances. Each case has to be decided on its own facts and other decided cases can hardly serve as binding precedents insofar as the factual aspects of the case are concerned. It is, no doubt, true that father is presumed by the statutes to be better suited to look after the welfare of the child, being normally the working member and head of the family, yet in each case the court has to see primarily to the welfare of the child in determining the question of his or her custody. Better financial resources of either of the parents or their love for the child may be one of the relevant considerations but cannot be the sole determining factor for the custody of the child. It is here that a heavy duty is cast on the court to exercise its judicial discretion judiciously in the background of all the relevant facts and circumstances, bearing in mind the welfare of the child as the paramount consideration.”

40. The principles as to custody and upbringing of a minor as delineated in para 809 of Halsbury's Laws of England 4th Edn., Vol. 1329, were also referred in Mausami Moitra Ganguli and it was stated thus:—

“22. In Halsbury's Laws of England (4th Edn., Vol. 13), the law pertaining to the custody and maintenance of children has been succinctly stated in the following terms:

“809. Principles as to custody and upbringing of minors.- Where in any proceedings before any court, the custody or upbringing of a minor is in question, the court, in deciding that question, must regard the welfare of the minor as the first and paramount consideration, and must not take into consideration whether from any other point of view the claim of the father in respect of such custody or upbringing is superior to that of the mother, or the claim of the mother is superior to that of the father. In relation to the custody or upbringing of a minor, a mother has the same rights and authority as the law allows to a father, and the rights and authority of mother and father are equal and are exercisable by either without the other.”

41. The principles in relation to custody of a minor child again came up for consideration in *Gaurav Nagpal v. Sumedha Nagpal* (2009) 1 SCC 42, and **it was reiterated that the paramount consideration in such matters would be ‘welfare of the child’ and not rights of parents under a statute for the time being in force. The court would have to give due weightage to the child's ordinary comfort, contentment, health, education, intellectual development, and favourable surroundings but over and above physical comfort, moral and ethical values would also have to be given importance.** It was stated thus:—

“50. When the court is confronted with conflicting demands made by the parents, each time it has to justify the demands. The court has not only to look at the issue on legalistic basis, in such matters human angles are relevant for deciding those issues. The court then does not give emphasis on what the parties say, it has to exercise a jurisdiction which is aimed at the welfare of the minor. As observed recently in *Mausami Moitra Ganguli* (2008) 7 SCC 673, the court has to give due weightage to the child's ordinary contentment, health, education, intellectual development and favourable surroundings but over and above physical comforts, the moral and ethical values have also to be noted. They are equal if not more important than the others.

51. The word “welfare” used in Section 13 of the Act has to be construed literally and must be taken in its widest sense. The moral and ethical welfare of the child must also weigh with the court as well as its physical well-being. Though the provisions of the special statutes which govern the rights of the parents or guardians may be taken into consideration, there is nothing which can stand in the way of the court exercising its *parens patriae* jurisdiction arising in such cases.”

42. A similar view was taken in *Gaytri Bajaj v. Jiten Bhalla* (2012) 12 SCC 471, and it was held that in a matter relating to child custody, the welfare, interest and desire of child has to be given paramount importance. It was observed as follows:—

“14. From the above it follows that an order of custody of minor children either under the provisions of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 or the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956 is required to be made by the court treating the interest and welfare of the minor to be of paramount importance. It is not the better right of either parent that would require adjudication while deciding their entitlement to custody.

The desire of the child coupled with the availability of a conducive and appropriate environment for proper upbringing together with the ability and means of the parent concerned to take care of the child are some of the relevant factors that have to be taken into account by the court while deciding the issue of custody of a minor. What must be emphasised is that while all other factors are undoubtedly relevant, it is the desire, interest and welfare of the minor which is the crucial and ultimate consideration that must guide the determination required to be made by the court.”

43. The question with regard to custody of a minor was again subject matter of consideration in *Vivek Singh v. Romani Singh* (2017) 3 SCC 231, and it was observed **that welfare of the child would be the prime consideration and psycho-social as also physical development of child for shaping of an independent personality would be of foremost concern of court as parens patriae in deciding grant of custody of a child.** It was observed as follows:—

“12. We understand that the aforesaid principle is aimed at serving twin objectives. In the first instance, it is to ensure that the child grows and develops in the best environment. The best interest of the child has been placed at the vanguard of family/custody disputes according the optimal growth and development of the child primacy over other considerations. The child is often left to grapple with the breakdown of an adult institution. While the parents aim to ensure that the child is least affected by the outcome, the inevitability of the uncertainty that follows regarding the child's growth lingers on till the new routine sinks in. The effect of separation of spouses, on children, psychologically, emotionally and even to some extent physically, spans from negligible to serious, which could be insignificant to noticeably critical. It could also have effects that are more immediate and transitory to long lasting thereby having a significantly negative repercussion in the advancement of the child. While these effects do not apply to every child of a separated or divorced couple, nor has any child experienced all these effects, the deleterious risks of maladjustment remains the objective of the parents to evade and the court's intent to circumvent. This right of the child is also based on individual dignity.

13...It has been emphasised by this Court also, time and again, following observations in *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India* (1997) 10 SCC 549.

“4. The child of today cannot develop to be a responsible and productive member of tomorrow's society unless an environment which is conducive to his social and physical health is assured to him. Every nation, developed or developing, links its future with the status of the child. Childhood holds the potential and also sets the limit to the future development of the society. Children are the greatest gift to humanity. Mankind has the best hold of itself. The parents themselves live for them. They embody the joy of life in them and in the innocence relieving the fatigue and drudgery in their struggle of daily life. Parents regain peace and happiness in the company of the children. The children signify eternal optimism in the human being and always provide the potential for human development. If the children are better equipped with a broader human output, the society will feel happy with them. Neglecting the children means loss to the society as a whole. If children are deprived of their childhood - socially, economically, physically and mentally - the nation gets deprived of the potential human resources for social progress, economic empowerment and peace and order, the social stability and good citizenry. The Founding Fathers of the Constitution, therefore, have emphasised the importance of the role of the child and the need of its best development.”

xxx

15. It hardly needs to be emphasised that a proper education encompassing skill development, recreation and cultural activities has a positive impact on the child. The children are the most important human resources whose development has a direct impact on the development of the nation, for the child of today with suitable health, sound education and constructive environment is the productive key member of the society. The present of the child links to the future of the nation, and while the children are the treasures of their parents, they are the assets who will be responsible for governing the nation. The tools of education, environment, skill and health shape the child thereby moulding the nation with the child equipped to play his part in the different spheres aiding the public and contributing to economic progression. The growth and advancement of the child with the personal interest is accompanied by a significant public interest, which arises because of the crucial role they play in nation building.”

(emphasis supplied)

At the outset, it is necessary to emphasise that a proceeding concerning

the custody of a minor is not to be determined merely on the basis of the legal rights of the competing claimants. The controlling and paramount consideration is the welfare and best interest of the minor. The Court, while exercising its *parens patriae* jurisdiction, is required to assess the totality of the circumstances, including the physical, emotional, educational, developmental and financial needs of the child, the stability of the proposed custodial environment, the capacity of the respective parties to provide care and protection, and the circumstances in which the child is likely to receive a secure and nurturing upbringing. The parental right, though relevant, is necessarily subordinate to the welfare of the child.

In the present case, petitioner No.2/wife has herself admitted that she is presently not earning and has no independent source of income. She has also stated that she is dependent upon her father for her sustenance. The material placed before the Court further indicates that the minor corpus are presently residing with the petitioner No.2 and their maternal grandfather. The fact that petitioner no. 2 is professionally qualified and capable of earning cannot, by itself, be treated as a circumstance adverse to her, nevertheless, while determining the present custodial arrangement, the Court is required to consider the actual circumstances obtaining on the date of determination and not a prospective or hypothetical financial position.

Similarly, although the maternal grandfather has disclosed that he is engaged in the business of running a mobile shop and property and real estate, no documentary evidence has been produced before this Court to establish his income or demonstrate the extent of financial resources presently available for the sustained care, education and upbringing of the minor corpus. His responsibility towards his other four unmarried daughters is also a relevant circumstance while assessing the overall stability of the proposed arrangement, though it cannot, by itself, determine the question of custody.

On the other hand, the petitioner No.1 has placed before this Court his personal affidavit disclosing his financial and residential circumstances. He has stated that he is running an industrial establishment in which

approximately 20–30 persons are employed and that he has sufficient income to maintain and support the minor corpus. He has further disclosed that he owns immovable properties, a residential house, a car, three two-wheelers and substantial jewellery, and that he has no outstanding liability. His affidavit further discloses that he has residential accommodation measuring approximately 3,000 square feet, equipped with basic amenities.

The petitioner No.1 has also assured the Court that he shall provide the minor corpus with proper education in a decent and suitable school and shall take all necessary steps for their physical, educational and overall development. He has further stated that his mother and other members of his family are available to extend assistance in taking care of the minor corpus. Thus, the material placed before the Court indicates that the petitioner No.1 possesses the requisite financial means and residential infrastructure to provide the minor corpus with a stable and secure living environment.

This Court is also conscious of the fact that the minor corpus are of tender age and have been residing with their mother and maternal grandfather. Their existing emotional attachment with them is, therefore, natural and deserves due regard. The fact that the children were reluctant to leave the lap of their mother and maternal grandfather during their interaction before the Court cannot, by itself, be construed as a rejection of their father. At the same time, the petitioner No.1, being their father, is equally entitled to have a meaningful and continuing relationship with them, subject always to the paramount consideration of their welfare.

The Court is, therefore, required to strike a balance between preserving the emotional bonds already developed by the minor corpus with their mother and maternal family and ensuring that they have access to the care, affection, support and resources available from their father. The custody order must not operate to sever or diminish the relationship of the children with either parent. Rather, it should facilitate a healthy and continuing relationship with both, to the extent compatible with their welfare.

Having regard to the entirety of the circumstances brought on record, including the tender age of the minor corpus, the present financial and residential circumstances of the parties, the material disclosed by the petitioner No.1 regarding his financial capacity and residential accommodation, his willingness to assume responsibility for the education and upbringing of the minor corpus, and the absence of any material before this Court demonstrating that the petitioner No.1 is presently disqualified from having their custody, this Court is of the considered opinion that the welfare and best interest of the minor corpus would presently be better served by placing their custody with their father, Mohammad Zubair Usman.

Accordingly, the custody of the minor corpus, namely, Huren Zubair and Noor Zubair, is handed over to their father, Mohammad Zubair Usman.

However, the grant of custody to the petitioner No.1 cannot be understood as extinguishing or diminishing the maternal relationship of petitioner no. 2 with the minor corpus. The children require the continued affection, care and emotional support of their mother, and it is in their welfare that their relationship with her be preserved and nurtured. Petitioner no. 2, Smt. Wajeehah Wajahat, shall, therefore, be entitled to visitation and interaction rights in the following manner:

- (i) She shall be entitled to visit the residence of the petitioner No.1 and meet the minor corpus every Sunday between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.;
- (ii) She shall also be entitled to interact with the minor corpus every day through video conferencing on a mobile phone between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m.; and
- (iii) The petitioner No.1 shall ensure that the aforesaid visitation and interaction rights of petitioner no. 2 are duly respected and facilitated and shall not, either himself or through any member of his family, create any obstruction or impediment in the exercise of such rights.

It is clarified that the aforesaid visitation and interaction arrangement is intended to preserve and strengthen the bond between the minor corpus and their mother and shall be implemented in a manner conducive to the

emotional well-being of the children. Both parties are expected to act with maturity and restraint and shall refrain from making any adverse statement against the other parent in the presence or hearing of the minor corpus.

The State authorities as well as respondent nos. 2 and 3 shall ensure due compliance of the aforesaid directions and extend necessary assistance, if required, for their effective implementation.

With the aforesaid directions, the instant habeas corpus petition stands **disposed of.**

(Sandeep Jain,J.)

September 28, 2026
Himanshu