



\$~76

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3609/2025**

AANCHAL AND ANR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Vandana Kumar, Mr. Mann Sehgal, Advocates along with Petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC for the State along with SI Sumit, PS Sagarpur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

04.11.2025

1. The Petitioners state that they have been in a relationship for the past eleven years and now intend to solemnize their marriage. They assert that, as theirs is an inter-caste union, Respondent Nos. 2 to 6 (mother, sister, brother-in-law and other relatives of Petitioner No. 2) oppose the relationship and have issued threats. Accordingly, they seek directions to the State to secure their safety and to prevent interference with their decision to marry.

2. The record includes copies of identity documents and school leaving certificates indicating that both Petitioners are majors. They also place photographs of a recent "Roka" ceremony, which show participation and



support from the parents of Petitioner No. 1.

3. Without entering upon the disputed allegations against Respondent Nos. 2 to 6, to whom notice has not been issued, 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. The Supreme Court has recognised that caste continues to exert a strong social influence in India, and that inter-caste marriages perform a valuable constitutional and societal function by promoting integration and reducing caste divisions. Such unions, the Supreme Court has observed, are in the national interest and must receive firm protection from any familial or communal interference.¹

4. Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC for the State, submits that a designated constable's contact has already been shared 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. If the Petitioners report any threat or attempt at interference by Respondent Nos. 2 to 6 or any other person, the police shall register a DD entry, extend immediate protection, and proceed in accordance with law.

5. These directions are preventive and protective in character. No



opinion is expressed on the veracity of the allegations levelled against Respondent Nos. 2 to 6 or civil or personal disputes, if any, between the parties.

6. With the above directions, the petition stands disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 4, 2025/MK

¹ *Lata Singh v. State of U.P.* (2006) 5 SCC 475.