

(2026) 08 KAR CK 2086
In the Karnataka High Court, Bengaluru Bench
Case No : Criminal Petition No. 9382 of 2026

Himani K.C.V.

APPELLANT

Vs

Enforcement Directorate

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-08-2026

Acts Referred:

Cr.P.C — Section 439(1)(b)
BNSS — Section 483(1)(b)

Citation : (2026) 08 KAR CK 2086

Hon'ble Judges : M. Nagaprasanna, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Sri. Rajath, Sri. Madhu N. Rao

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Heard the learned counsel, Sri. Rajath appearing for the petitioner and learned counsel, Sri. Madhu N. Rao representing the respondent - the Enforcement Directorate.

2. This Court, owing to the impending urgency or the right of the petitioner to travel beyond the jurisdiction being curtailed, this Court, on 31.07.2026, had passed the following order:

" Learned counsel Sri. Madhu.N.Rao appearing for the respondent files his objections.

The only prayer for the present by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner be permitted to travel at least within the shores of the Nation, not beyond the shores of the Nation, as the concerned Court has directed that the petitioner shall not leave the jurisdiction of the Court.

In the light of the said submission, the petitioner is at liberty to travel anywhere in the Country without permission, but if has to travel beyond the shores of Nation, it cannot be without prior permission from the competent Court of law.

It does not mean that the petitioner would not cooperate with the investigation. The petitioner shall continue to cooperate with the investigation.

List the matter on **05.08.2026** in the **fresh matters list.**"

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that he be reserved liberty to knock at the doors of this Court or the concerned Court, if the petitioner is wanting to travel beyond the shores of the Nation and would submit that the petition be disposed reserving such liberty.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is neither an accused nor the witness. Therefore, the proceedings must not be permitted to be continued.

5. Even the learned counsel appearing for the respondent would seriously dispute the said position. Be that as it may.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would restrict his submission for preserving liberty to the petitioner to knock at the doors of the appropriate *fora* in the event he would want to travel beyond the shores of the Nation.

In that light, reserving such liberty, the petition stands disposed.