



\$~16

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1734/2026**

VINOD KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Bharat Tyagi, Mr.Rajneesh Tyagi, Mr.Pravesh Saini, Mr.Hanny Bhardwaj, Ms.Nidhi Bhardwaj and Ms.Ruchika Dhingra, Advs. along with the petitioner in person

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel (Crl) for the State with Ms.Priyam Agarwal & Mr.Aryan Sachdeva, Advs. along with Insp. Deepak Pandey and SI Arvind Kumar, P.S. Jafrabad

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **29.05.2026**

CRL. M.A. 17475/2026 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(CRL) 1734/2026

2. The present Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking issuance of a Writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus, directing the respondent nos.1 and 6 to produce the respondent no.2/Ms.P, who is stated to be in a live-in-relationship with the petitioner.



3. The petitioner is a permanent resident of Meerut, in the State of Uttar Pradesh. In the writ petition, it is also stated that the petitioner, along with respondent no. 2, were living in a live-in relationship at Noida, Uttar Pradesh, till 24.12.2025, when the respondent no. 2 was taken away forcefully and unlawfully by respondent nos. 3 and 4 from Maujpur Metro Station Gate No. 5, Maujpur, Delhi to Modinagar, which is also in the State of Uttar Pradesh. The respondent no. 2 is also stated to be illegally confined in District Hapur, Uttar Pradesh.

4. According to us, the entire cause of action, if any, for filing the present petition has arisen in the State of Uttar Pradesh. Except for the statement that the respondent no. 2 was taken away from Maujpur Metro Station, Gate No. 5, Delhi, it is admitted that the petitioner and respondent no. 2 were permanently residing in Noida, Uttar Pradesh, and that the respondent no. 2 is presently located in District Hapur, Uttar Pradesh.

5. We, therefore, decline to entertain the present writ petition, leaving it open to the petitioner to avail of his remedies in accordance with the law, before a court of appropriate jurisdiction.

6. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

MAY 29, 2026/rv/ik