



\$~80

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2342/2024**

ARSHI PARVEEN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Himanshu Yadav, Mr.
Rupal Yadav, Mr. Manish
Sharma, Mr. Rohan
Chaudhary, Ms. Farha
Naaz, Ms. Keerti Gupta,
Ms. Akriti Aggarwal, Ms.
Anam Zehra, Ms. Aparna
S. Narayan, Ms. Niharika
Dhir, Mr. Hemant, Mr.
Abhinav Chauhan, Ms.
Surabhi Chhabra, Ms.
Priyam Gupta, Mr.
Digvijay Singh Bisht, Dr.
Alam Ali & Mr. Shameen
Ali, Adv.

versus

**STATE OF NCT DELHI THRU
SECRETARY & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC for
the State with Mr. Kshitiz
Garg, Mr. Ashvini Kumar
& Ms. Chavi Lazarus,
Adv.
HC Sandeep Kumar, PS-
Dayalpur

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN**

**ORDER
05.08.2024**

%

1. The present petition is filed seeking following prayers:
“1. Issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to refrain from harassing and illegally detaining the petitioner.
2. Direct the respondents to ensure that no



further complaints from the petitioner's family regarding her marriage are entertained without proper verification of facts.

3. Grant any other relief that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.”

2. The petitioner claims that she is an adult and has married on her own will despite which her family members are harassing her.

3. The learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State, at the outset, submits that a complaint was received from the parents of the petitioner that she is a minor and is missing.

4. He submits that since the allegation in regard to cognizable offences have been made, the matter will be looked into and an appropriate action, either closing of the complaint or registration of FIR, will be taken.

5. The High Court while exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot pass any directions against the parents for not contacting their child.

6. The petitioner is at liberty to file appropriate proceedings in case she does not want to remain in touch with her parents or does not want their interference in her family life.

7. Since the complaint has been made in regard to a cognizable offence, the State also cannot be restricted from making appropriate inquiry.

8. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 5, 2024

“SS”