

\$~1

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

+ **W.P. (CRL.) 1302/2020**

SMT. FIZA FATIMA @ SHALINI YADAV & ANR..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr.Mohd. Ahmed, Advocate.**

Petitioners in person through video conferencing.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS. Respondent

Represented by: **Ms.Nandita Rao, ASC for State.**

**Mr.Pawan Kumar, Advocate for
defendant No.4 with defendant No.4
in person through video conferencing.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER
10.09.2020

%

The hearing has been conducted through Video Conferencing.

1. The present petition has been filed by Smt.Fiza Fatima @ Shalini Yadav and Mohd.Faizal seeking protection. According to the petitioners, petitioner No.1 left her parental home at Kanpur on 29th June, 2020 and on 2nd July, 2020 both the petitioners solemnised their marriage according to Muslim rites and rituals in Delhi. The marriage was thereafter registered with the Registrar of Marriages at Ghaziabad, U.P. on 3rd July, 2020.
2. Pursuant to a complaint being lodged by respondent No.4, that is, father of petitioner No.1, the officials of PS Kidwai Nagar, Kanpur and PS Chandni Mahal were trying to trace the petitioners. Hence the petitioner No.1 applied for police protection to PS Chandni Mahal followed by the present writ petition.

3. When this petition came up before this Court on 24th August, 2020, both the petitioners were present in person through video conferencing and they stated that they are major and have married of their own free will contrary to the wishes of respondent No.4. Since the police officers from PS Kidwai Nagar, Kanpur were also present with SI Mohit Malik from PS Chandni Mahal, they were directed to get recorded the statement of petitioner No.1 under Section 164 Cr.P.C. before the learned Duty Magistrate.

4. A status report has been filed by the state indicating that the statement of petitioner No.1 has been recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C.

5. Respondent No.4 is present in person through video conferencing along with his learned counsel who states that the respondent No.4 does wish to interfere in the lives of the petitioners.

6. In view of the statement of respondent No.4 and the fact that the statement of petitioner No.1 has been recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. the present petition is disposed of as no further orders are called for. It is however, clarified that in case there is any specific complaint of threat by the petitioners, action thereon will be taken in accordance with law by the SHO, PS Chandni Mahal.

7. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2020

‘vn’