



\$~47

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
 % **Date of decision: 30<sup>th</sup> October, 2025**

+ W.P.(CRL) 3434/2025  
 FARUKH QURESHI PHARUK .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Azeem Mehmood Alvi and Mr.  
 MD Qaisar Alvi, Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI THROUGH SHO WELCOME POLICE  
 STATION & ORS. ....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel  
 (Crl.) withy Ms. Priyam Agarwal and  
 Mr. Aryan Sachdeva, Advocates For  
 R-1  
 Mr. Shashank Sharma and Mr. Anshul  
 Kumar, Advocates for R-5, R-6 & R-7

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK CHAUDHARY**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**J U D G M E N T**

1. Present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 B.N.S.S., 2023 and petitioner, *inter alia*, seeks directions in the nature of *Habeas Corpus* to the respondents to produce his missing wife i.e. Ms. Simran Qureshi who has, allegedly, been illegally detained by the respondent no. 5 and 6 (parents of Ms. Simran) and their family members at their residence in Dhaulpur, Rajasthan.
2. Petitioner claims to have married Ms. Simran on 11.09.2025 as per Islamic rites and rituals at Hazrat Nizamuddin East, New Delhi - 110013.
3. Thereafter, they started living together at Kabir Nagar, North East Delhi - 110094. When they informed their families, Ms. Simran's parents allegedly reacted violently and threatened to kill both Ms. Simran and the



petitioner. Subsequently, they softened their stance and accepted the marriage. Some days later, the father and brother of Ms. Simran came to Delhi and took Ms. Simran to Rajasthan with the promise that she would return to Delhi after a week.

4. Since then, the petitioner has been unable to establish any contact with Ms. Simran.

5. Today, Ms. Simran has appeared through *video-conferencing* and denies the fact of a marriage taking place between her and the petitioner. She submits that she is 23 years old and has completed her Graduation and would like to stay with her family only. She further states that she does not want to go with the petitioner, at all.

6. Our interaction with her clearly indicates that she does not want to go with petitioner. As already noted above, she has, even denied the factum of marriage.

7. Since Ms. Simran is major and can take her own independent decision, no further order is required to be passed in the present petition.

8. Resultantly, the petition is dismissed in aforesaid terms.

9. All rights and contentions of parties are left open.

**(VIVEK CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

**(MANOJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**OCTOBER 30, 2025/dr/pb**