



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

D.B. Habeas Corpus Petition No. 216/2026

Pala Ram S/o Jagdish Kumar, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of
Ward No. 44, Near Gotam Budh School, Sureshiya,
Hanumangarh.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Ministry
Of Home Affairs, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Superintendent Of Police, Hanumangarh.
3. The Station House Officer, Of Police Station
Hanumangarh, Hanumangarh.
4. Vikram S/o Angraj Ram, Resident Of Ward No. 04 Kwsn,
Ganganagar, District Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Anita

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Deepak Choudhary, GA-cum-AAG
Mr. Subhash Chandra, ASI, PS,
Hanumangarh Junction, District,
Hanumangarh.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH

Order(Oral)

05/05/2026

Per: Arun Monga, J

1. The petitioner, father of the alleged detainee/corpus, asserts that his daughter/detinue is being illegally confined by private respondent No. 4 and hence, the instant petition seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of habeas corpus and/or any other direction to produce the detainee in court.

2. Notice was issued. After making preliminary enquiry by the Police Officials, a report dated 04.05.2026 has been tendered in the course of hearing which is taken on record. English translation of relevant portion of the same reads as under:-

“During investigation, it was found that Doli is residing with her husband Vikram Singh of her own free will. After Doli was traced on 25.04.2026, a separate order for closure of search proceedings in the present MPR was received from the Circle Officer, Hanumangarh, on 30.04.2026. The factual report is submitted accordingly.”

3. The police report, *ibid*, reveals that the daughter is not only a major but is also fully capable of taking her own decisions. She left her parental home of her own free will and subsequently married private respondent No. 4.
4. Both the alleged detainee and respondent No. 4 are adults, fully competent to take their own decisions and entitled to choose their life partners in accordance with their free will.
5. Thus it appears to be a case where the father has not approved of his daughter's choice of life partner, and not a case of illegal confinement. In the premise, it is not for this Court to proceed further with the writ proceedings.
6. The parties are at liberty to resolve their differences in the manner they deem fit.
7. The daughter/alleged detainee is a major, has married of her own free will, and is at liberty to reside and conduct her life in the manner she considers appropriate.
8. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed. Any pending application also stands dismissed.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J

(ARUN MONGA),J