



\$~47

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 4006/2024**

FAREEN @ GEETA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rohit Mahiya, Mr. Trilok Chand,
Advocate

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi ASC for State with
SI Mahesh, PS Bhalswa Dairy, Delhi
Dr. M. Khan and Mr. Manoj Kumar
Sharma, Advocate for R3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

%

20.03.2025

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

CRL.M.A. 8474/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.A. 8473/2025 (for directions)

2. It appears that petitioners got married interfaith and faced strong resistance from family and society of one of them, so they approached this court seeking protection of life and liberty. Admittedly, petitioners are major in age. On the very first date, the predecessor bench directed the local police to ensure security to the petitioners. On the next date, the private respondents (*parents and relatives of petitioner no. 1*) appeared and were apprised that the petitioners got married according to Hindu rites and ceremonies. That day, parents of petitioner no. 1 accepted the decision of



the petitioners and only requested for opportunity to meet petitioner no. 1 over videoconference call so that they could ensure her wellbeing. But it is informed today by the learned prosecutor on instruction of Inspector S.S. Yadav of PS Bhalswa Dairy that parents of petitioner no. 1 refused to talk to her. On last date, the learned predecessor bench disposed of the matter and posted it for reporting compliance on 28.07.2025.

3. Now, this application has been filed by parents of petitioner no. 1, claiming that a Muslim girl cannot legally get married with a Hindu boy without either of them converting their religion and that the parents of petitioner no. 1 do not recognize the Arya Samaj Mandir marriage.

4. After some arguments, learned counsel for parents of petitioner no. 1 seeks permission to withdraw this application, admitting that petitioners have already attained the age of majority and parents of petitioner no.1 have no *locus standi* to challenge their marriage, that too in the proceedings of the present nature.

5. Accordingly the application is dismissed as withdrawn.

6. However, from this application it appears that the issue is still simmering and threat to life and limb of petitioners cannot be ruled out.

7. Therefore, the petition is revived.

8. It is informed by learned ASC on instructions that now the petitioners have shifted out of jurisdiction of PS Bhalswa Dairy, but they are hesitant of disclosing their current address. That hesitance is understandable in view of their apprehensions.

9. In order to ensure complete protection to life and limb of petitioners, a copy of this order be given *dasti* to Inspector S.S. Yadav from PS Bhalswa Dairy present in court, with the direction that he shall place the same before



the DCP/SP of the area where the petitioners have now shifted and thereafter, local police of the concerned area shall ensure complete protection to life and limb of both the petitioners.

10. At this stage, counsel for parents of petitioner no. 1 requests that his clients be granted another opportunity to interact with petitioner no. 1 through videoconferencing. This request can be allowed. It is directed that tomorrow (21.03.2025) at 03:00 pm, there shall be a videoconferencing between the petitioners and parents of petitioner no. 1, which shall be organized by Inspector S.S. Yadav and for that purpose, parents of petitioner no. 1 shall report in PS Bhalswa Dairy, from where videoconferencing with petitioners shall be carried out.

W.P.(CRL) 4006/2024

11. Relist on 04.04.2025. It is specifically directed that in order to ensure wellbeing of both petitioners, on the next date, they shall join hearing of this case through videoconferencing.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

MARCH 20, 2025/as

Click here to check corrigendum, if any