



\$~107

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3527/2024**

SAMAN KAUSER & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Akshit Tomar, Adv.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI
AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC
for the State with SI Lalit
Kumar, PS Bindapur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

12.11.2024

CRL.M.A. 33771/2024 (*exemption from filing original documents*)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 3527/2024

3. By the present petition, the petitioner seeks protection from Respondent Nos. 3 & 4.
4. It is the case of the petitioners that they got married against the wish of the family members of Petitioner No. 1. Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 are the father and brother of Petitioner No. 1 respectively.
5. The petitioners allegedly got married on 07.11.2024 and have filed the present petition on the same day itself.
6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the father of Petitioner No. 1 is threatening that if Petitioner No. 1



comes back to their house, she will be beaten up.

7. On being pointedly asked as to what is the need of the petitioners going to the parents' house, the petitioners have not been able to explain.

8. The petitioners are now married to each other. They do not need to go to their parents' house if they don't wish. They are also at liberty to sever all ties with the family members and not remain in touch with the parents.

9. If at any stage they fell threat to their life and liberty, the petitioners are at liberty to approach the concerned Police Station.

10. The Police is duty bound to take action on receipt of complaint alleging cognizable offences.

11. The petitioners are also at liberty to approach the concerned SHO and obtain the phone number of the Beat Officer who can be called as and when the threat to life and liberty is felt.

12. However, this Court, while exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, cannot pass any order to the effect of injuncting the parents from speaking to their children.

13. In the opinion of this Court, no order is required to be passed at this stage.

14. The present petition is, therefore, dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 12, 2024

'KDK'