



\$~12

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1667/2025**

SURRINDERJIT KAUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pawan Narang, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Nitin Gupta and Mr. Ayush
Chauhan, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ansh Singh Luthra and
Mr. Madhav Kumar, Advocates for
R-3.
Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC for State with
Mr. Kshitiz Garg, Mr. Ashvini
Kumar, Ms. Chavi Lazarus, Mr Nitish
Dhawan and Ms. Sanskriti Nimbekar,
Advocates.
Mr. Sukhbir Singh, SI, PS-Tilak
Marg.
Mr. Neeraj Dubey, SPC for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

13.08.2025

%

1. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950 read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ and Section 33(1) of the Aadhaar (Targeted Delivery of Financial and Other Subsidies, Benefits and Services) Act, 2016,² seeks *inter alia*

¹ "BNSS"

² "Aadhaar Act"



directions to Respondent Np. 2/Unique Identification Authority of India³ to disclose information with respect to the changes made to the Aadhar Card of Respondent No. 3, the son of the Petitioner.

2. The Petitioner lodged a complaint with Police Station Tilak Marg, recorded *vide* Diary No. 12-LC dated 25th April, 2025, alleging that her husband's name in all official documents is "Jaswant Singh", and that the name of her son, as reflected in his original Aadhaar Card, is "Jaswinder Singh". She alleges that Respondent No. 3, in collusion with unidentified officials of UIDAI, fraudulently procured an updated Aadhaar Card, in which his name was changed to "Jaswinder Ranjit Singh" and his father's name to "Jaswant Pratap Singh", by furnishing false information. It is further alleged that this altered Aadhaar Card was used in the execution of sale deeds for properties located in Rajasthan and Gurugram, while the original Aadhaar Card was used for transactions in Delhi. Based on the above allegations, the Petitioner seeks the following reliefs:

- "(a) Pass an appropriate Writ/ Order/ Direction, directing the Respondent No. 2 (Unique Identification Authority of India) to disclose the information as sought by the Respondent No. 1 (Police Station Tilak Marg) vide Notice dated 13th February 2025;*
- (b) Direct the Respondent No. 1 (Police Station Tilak Marg) to register the FIR under relevant provisions of law against the unknown officials of the Respondent No. 2 (Unique Identification Authority of India) and the Respondent No. 3 (Jaswinder Singh); and*
- (c) Pass any other or further Order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper."*

3. The Petitioner invokes this Court's jurisdiction on the ground that disclosure of information from UIDAI is indispensable to facilitate the enquiry into her complaint. She submits that, in view of Section 33(1) of the Aadhaar Act, such disclosure can be ordered only by a court not inferior to a

³ "UIDAI"



High Court. Taking note of this statutory requirement, this Court, at an earlier hearing, directed the State to file a status report on the progress of the enquiry.

4. In compliance with the Court's direction, the State has filed a status report, the relevant portion of which reads as follows:

"2. During enquiry, a request/notice was sent to UIDAI Authority and enquired the procedure/rules to make any alteration in name in Adhar card and to provide the documents submitted by Jaswinder singh before the Adhar Authority to change his name in Adhar Card. The reply of authority was received in which they refused to provide such information.

3. After that a notice/request was sent Sh. Jaswinder Singh and he joined the enquiry and he stated that he is biological son of his father and he fully entitled to amend his name in his personal Identification. Further he stated that he is purely sentimental with name "Partap" and "Vikram" and he took this name from his uncle's name namely Mohinder Pratap Singh Rana and Rajendra Vikram Singh to keep them alive who passed away in young age.

4. Further Sh. Jaswinder Singh stated that he just changes his and his father's middle name in his Adhar Card and did not change his Adhar number and the Adhar number is same in both Adhar card. Further he stated that to change in his name he has followed/completed all procedure of Adhar Rules which required to make any alteration in name in Adhar Card.

5. Regarding use of Adhar card in sale/purchase of property, Sh. Jaswinder Singh stated that the property which he sold or give on rent are registered on his name and he has right to sale it. Further he stated that his mother (complainant) was residing with him but in 2023 her sister took her under the pretext of caring her and since then his sister is using his mother to file false complaint against him to harass/pressurise him so that he took back the all cases/litigations which he has filed against her.

6. Further the property document which were attached with complaint were also checked and it is found that Sh. Jaswinder Singh has not used his altered Adhar card in sale and purchase of property which are situated at Nehru Place and Connaught place Delhi."

5. On the basis of the material gathered during the enquiry, the State has concluded that no cognizable offence is made out against the Respondents and accordingly, closed the complaint. While the Petitioner had alleged that



Respondent No. 3, in collusion with officials of UIDAI, had fraudulently altered his own and his father's names in the updated Aadhaar Card, the State's report records that only the middle names were changed, the Aadhaar number remained identical in both versions, and the alteration was claimed to have been carried out in compliance with the prescribed Aadhaar procedures. The State has found no evidence to substantiate the allegation that the altered Aadhaar Card was used for the sale or purchase of the properties cited in the complaint.

6. Having considered the submissions and the status report, it is evident that the complaint stands closed on the finding that no cognizable offence is disclosed. In view of this development, the primary reliefs sought in the present writ petition, particularly those seeking disclosure from UIDAI for the purpose of facilitating the enquiry, have lost their relevance and are rendered infructuous. It is well settled that in the absence of a live cause of action, the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 will not be exercised merely for academic purposes.

7. Nevertheless, if the Petitioner is aggrieved by the closure of the complaint, she retains the liberty to pursue appropriate remedies as available in law. Should a competent court, in the course of such proceedings, consider it necessary to obtain information from UIDAI, it would be open to the State to approach that court for directions in terms of Section 33(1) of the Aadhaar Act, which governs disclosure of Aadhaar-related information.

8. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 13, 2025/nk