



\$~24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% **Date of decision: 19th September, 2025**

+ W.P.(CRL) 3049/2025 & CRL.M.A. 28203/2025

SH BHAGAT RAM

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Varun Jain, Advocate

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel
(Crl.) with Ms. Priyam Agarwal and
Mr. Aryan Sachdeva, Advocates
Insp. Satya Prakash, SHO PS PIA and
SI Divya, IO

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK CHAUDHARY

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner Mr. Bhagat Ram has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 B.N.S.S., 2023 in the nature of *Habeus Corpus* seeking direction to respondent to produce his wife Geeta Devi before this Court.
2. Case of the petitioner is that he got married to Geeta Devi on 12.08.2019 at Village Valmara, Post Office Udaipur, Almora, Uttrakhand and from such wedlock, they are blessed with two sons.
3. On 26.08.2025, brother of his wife dropped Ms. Geeta Devi and her younger son at Anand Vihar ISBT, Delhi at about 12.10 PM and got them boarded in a bus heading Ram Nagar, Uttrakhand. However, they did not reach back. Petitioner made his best efforts to search them but his such efforts did not yield any fruitful result. Therefore, petitioner reported the



matter to the police on 27.08.2025 regarding missing of his wife and younger son *vide* GD no. 0128A dated 27.08.2025.

4. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel informs that police was able to contact Ms. Geeta Devi and she is, presently, residing in Mumbai and does not want to go back to her husband on account of certain personal issues.

5. A comprehensive report in this regard has been shown.

6. Let it be made part of the record.

7. Ms. Geeta Devi, who is 28 years of age, has also joined the proceedings through *videoconferencing*. She submits that she has voluntarily left the company of her husband and has chosen to settle down in Mumbai and does not want to go back to her husband on account of his conduct as he is habitual drunkard and inflicts cruelty upon her.

8. Her such assertion about the conduct of petitioner has been refuted by learned counsel for petitioner.

9. Fact, however, remains that in view of her aforesaid statement, there is no requirement of passing any order in the present petition. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

10. Pending application also stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

11. All rights and contentions of the parties are, however, left open.

**(VIVEK CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

**(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE**

SEPTEMBER 19, 2025/dr/sj