



\$~87

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1172/2026, CRL.M.A. 11198/2026**

**SONALI NATANI & ANR.**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Bhardwaj, Mr. Adarsh Verma, Mr. Jayant Chaudhry, Mr. Rohan Chauhan, Mr. Harshit Soni and Mr. Ravi Prakash

versus

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

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC with Ms. Priya Rai, Advocate with SI Suresh Kumar Meena, PS New Usmanpur for State  
Mr. Shiv Mangal Sharma, AAG/SOR and Mr. Puneet Parihar, Advocates for R-4 to 6  
Mr. Gorangg Gupta, Advocate for- 7 to 10 ((Through VC).

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN**

**ORDER**

% **16.04.2026**

**CRL.M.A. 11198/2026 (Exemption)**

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

**W.P.(CRL) 1172/2026**

1. By way of the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners seek a direction for police protection against apprehended threats to their safety from respondent Nos. 7 to 10,

**W.P.(CRL) 1172/2026**

**Page 1 of 3**



who are stated to be the family members of petitioner No. 1.

2. The petitioners claim to have solemnized their marriage and have placed on record a marriage certificate issued by the Sanatan Vedic Samaj Kalyan Sansthan, indicating that the marriage was solemnized on 02.04.2026. The said certificate reflects the dates of birth of petitioner No. 1 (wife) and petitioner No. 2 (husband) as 09.06.2002 and 01.07.2001, respectively. The aforesaid dates are also borne out from their Aadhaar Cards and school certificates, which have been placed on record.

3. Mr. Vivek Bhardwaj, learned counsel for the petitioners, further submits that the marriage has also been duly registered. A copy of the marriage certificate dated 06.04.2026 issued by the Office of District Magistrate, Vishwas Nagar, Delhi, has been handed over in Court and the same is taken on record.

4. It is the contention of the petitioners that their marriage is opposed by the family members of petitioner No. 1, including respondent Nos. 7 to 10, and that they apprehend threats from the said persons, for which they seek protection.

5. Mr. Gaurang Gupta, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 7 to 10, assures the Court that the said respondents have no intention to threaten or cause any harm to the petitioners. However, he submits that the family members of petitioner No. 1 are apprehensive that she may have been compelled to enter into the relationship with petitioner No. 2.

6. At my request, Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned counsel, who is present in Court, interacted with petitioner No. 1 independently and submits that petitioner No. 1 has stated that the marriage was solemnized with her free



consent, voluntarily, and without any fear or coercion.

7. Mr. Rahul Tyagi, learned Additional Standing Counsel [“ASC”], appearing on advance notice on behalf of the State, submits that the telephone numbers of the SHO and the beat constable having jurisdiction over the address mentioned in the memo of parties shall be provided to the petitioners, so that they may be contacted in the event of any exigency.

8. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and as no further orders are sought in the present writ petition, the same is disposed of in terms of the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

9. The Court appreciates the assistance rendered by Ms. Arya.

**PRATEEK JALAN, J**

**APRIL 16, 2026**  
SV/SD/