



\$~93

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(CRL) 935/2026 & CRL.M.A. 8867/2026

AMRITA KUMARI AND ANRPetitioner

Through: Ms. Harvinder Chowdhury, Mr.
Nishesh Sharma, Mr. Atul Kumar
Yadav, Advocates.

versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE DELHI AND ORS.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC with
Arjit Sharma, Advocate.
SI Vishal Lamba, PS-Shakarpur.
Mr. Azmat M. Amanullah, ASC
for State of Bihar with Ms. Nitya
Sharma, Advocate.
Mr. Anil Mittal, SC for State of
UP, with Mr. Atul Chauhan,
Advocate.
Ms. Veena Ralli, *Amicus Curiae*.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **24.03.2026**

1. Further to the order dated 20.03.2026, Ms. Harvinder Chowdhury, learned counsel for the petitioners, has handed over a copy of the order dated 23.03.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the writ petition (Diary No. 17020/2026) preferred by the petitioners, whereby the said writ petition has been disposed of as infructuous, in view of the pendency of the present petition before this Court.

2. Mr. Anil Mittal, learned Standing Counsel for the State of Uttar Pradesh, and Mr. Azmat M. Amanullah, learned Additional Standing



Counsel for the State of Bihar, are also present, in addition to Ms. Chowdhury, along with Dr. Nishesh Sharma, and Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, learned Additional Standing Counsel (Criminal) for the State.

3. As recorded in the order dated 20.03.2026, the petitioners are a 19-year-old woman and a 22-year-old man. Ms. Chowdhury submits that the petitioners are both majors and intend to marry each other, and have approached this Court seeking protection from apprehended threats from their respective family members. The father of petitioner No. 2, Mr. Nebulal, who is arrayed as respondent No. 9, is also present in Court alongwith the petitioners.

4. At my request, Ms. Veena Ralli, learned counsel and Senior Mediator at *Samadhan*, the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre, interacted with the petitioners as well as the father of petitioner No. 2, with a view to ascertaining the issues and exploring the possible resolution of the matter.

5. I have held proceedings in chamber in the presence of Ms. Ralli, and learned counsel for the parties. Ms. Ralli submits that she has had separate interactions with the petitioners as well as with the father of petitioner No. 2. I have also interacted with them.

6. The petitioners have expressed their desire to accompany the father of petitioner No. 2 to his native place at *Village Jaitpur, Tehsil Harraiya, District Basti, Uttar Pradesh*. The father of petitioner No. 2 has conveyed that he has no objection to the proposed marriage and is willing to take the petitioners alongwith him to his native place. The petitioners state that they propose to leave Delhi.

7. Although it is stated that the marriage has not yet been solemnised,



the petitioners submit that they intend to marry each other. Having regard to the fact that the petitioners appear, *prima facie*, to have attained the age of majority on the basis of the Aadhaar cards placed on record, there is no legal impediment to their proposed course of action.

8. Ms. Chowdhury, however, submits that there remains an apprehension of threat from the family of petitioner No. 1, and further states that she has received threatening calls from two persons claiming to be the cousins of petitioner No. 1.

9. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties, with the following directions:

- a) The petitioners shall inform the Investigating Officer of Police Station Shakarpur, who is present in Court, of the place where they propose to reside until their departure from Delhi. The Investigating Officer shall coordinate with the jurisdictional Station House Officer to ensure that the petitioners are provided protection in the event of any exigency, until they leave Delhi.
- b) Mr. Mittal is also requested to alert the jurisdictional police station to ensure that the petitioners, as well as the family of petitioner No. 2, are not subjected to any harassment or threat in the hometown of petitioner No. 2.
- c) Mr. Amanullah is also requested to liaise with the police authorities having jurisdiction over the hometown of petitioner No. 1, to obviate the possibility of any untoward incident at the instance of her family.
- d) Ms. Chowdhury submits that she has also been receiving threatening calls. Mr. Bhandari states that he shall ensure



coordination with the Station House Officers having jurisdiction over her residence and chamber, to ensure that she does not face any harassment. Ms. Chowdhury may also approach the concerned Station House Officer, if necessary.

10. Ms. Chowdhury submits that certain larger issues concerning the protection of couples who have fled from their homes, also require adjudication, for which she proposes to file a Public Interest Litigation. In the event such proceedings are instituted, they will have to be considered by the Division Bench of this Court, in accordance with the Roster. There is no occasion for this Court to make any further observation on this aspect.

11. No further orders are sought in the present petition, which accordingly stands disposed of. Pending application also stands disposed of.

12. The Court expresses its appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered by Ms. Ralli, learned *Amicus Curiae*, as well as by learned counsel for all the parties.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MARCH 24, 2026

'Bhupi'/SD/