



\$~79

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3803/2025, CRL.M.A. 34291/2025**

HEENA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravi Kant Kaushal, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT DELHI AND ORSRespondents

**Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for State
with SI Abhishek, PS-PP Pur, Delhi.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

18.11.2025

%

1. The Petitioners, both adults (Petitioner No. 1 being 33 years of age and Petitioner No. 2 aged around 27 years), have approached this Court seeking protection of their lives and personal liberty. They assert their fundamental rights under Articles 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India to marry and cohabit without fear, interference, or coercion.
2. Petitioner No. 1 states that she voluntarily left her parental home on 27th September, 2025. The Petitioners thereafter solemnized an inter-faith marriage on 30th September, 2025, in accordance with Hindu rites, following the voluntary conversion of Petitioner No. 1 to the Hindu religion. This entire position has been affirmed by Petitioner No. 1 in her Statement-cum-Affidavit dated 12th November, 2025. Copies of the marriage certificate and the aforesaid Statement-cum-Affidavit have been placed on record and perused by this Court.



3. It is alleged that the family members of Petitioner No. 1 falsely lodged a missing/kidnapping complaint at P.S. Bhojpur, Moradabad (U.P.), in an attempt to criminalise a consensual union between two adults. They further assert a grave and immediate apprehension of honour-based harm owing to the hostility of Petitioner No. 1's family members. It is additionally alleged that officials of P.S. Bhojpur, without any authority, warrant, or prior intimation to the Delhi Police, conducted a raid at the residence of the Petitioners' relatives in Pul Prahladpur, Delhi, and took one such relative into custody, in disregard of the mandatory inter-State protocols.

4. Without delving into the disputed allegations levelled against Respondent Nos. 2 to 7, to whom notice has not been issued, it bears emphasis that the legal position is well-settled; the freedom to choose a life partner is an intrinsic part of personal liberty and privacy under Article 21 of the Constitution. Where two consenting adults decide to marry or cohabit, neither family nor community can lawfully obstruct that choice or subject them to pressure, social sanctions, or threats.

5. Mr. Anand V Khatri, ASC for the State, submits that a designated constable's contact has already been shared with the Petitioners pursuant to an earlier complaint. Nonetheless, directions are issued to ensure the Petitioners' safety. The SHO of the jurisdictional police station shall conduct a brief threat-assessment forthwith and, based on its outcome, take preventive steps permissible in law, including but not limited to appropriate diary entries, beat patrolling near the Petitioners' current residence, and such other measures as are necessary to deter harassment or intimidation to the couple. If the Petitioners report any threat or attempt at interference by the Petitioner's relatives, Respondent Nos. 2 to 7 or any other person, the police



shall register a DD entry, extend immediate protection, and proceed in accordance with law.

6. These directions are preventive and protective in character. No opinion is expressed on the veracity of the allegations levelled against Respondent Nos. 2 to 7.

7. With the above directions, the petition stands disposed of, along with pending application.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 18, 2025