



2026:DHC:1260-DB



\$~1

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

**Date of decision: 12.02.2026**

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3838/2025**

ROSHANI DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Abhishek Kaushik and  
Mr.Shubham, Advs. along with  
Petitioner in person.  
Mr.Tejpal in person (son of  
petitioner)

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Sanjay Lao, SC (Crl.) with  
Ms.Priyam Agarwal,  
Mr.Abhinav Kr. Arya and  
Mr.Aryan Sachdeva, Advs. and  
Insp. Ravi Prakash Meena, PS  
J.P. Kalan, Dwarka Distt.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking a Writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus for production of the son of the petitioner, that is, Mr.Tejpal.

2. Mr.Tejpal appeared before this Court on 21.11.2025 and had expressed his desire to stay with his mother, that is, the petitioner



herein. Keeping in view his desire, this Court, while referring the parties to mediation, observed that he is at liberty to take his own independent decision including staying with his mother.

3. We are informed that since that day he has been staying with the petitioner.

4. Today, he is present in person before this Court. He again states that he would like to continue to stay with his mother.

5. The learned counsel for the wife and the child of Mr.Teupal submits that as far as they are concerned, they would be happy if Mr.Teupal stays with them, however, they have no objection if Mr.Teupal continues to stay with the petitioner.

6. In view of the above, no further directions are required to be passed except stating that Mr.Teupal can choose to stay wherever he wishes, as he is a major.

7. At the same time, the learned counsel for the petitioner informs this Court that the respondent no.3 does not have the requisite permissions and clearances for acting as a de-addiction centre. He submits that the operations of the respondent no.3 without such permission would be illegal.

8. As none is present for the respondent no.3, we do not go further in this allegation except stating that the respondent no.2, that is, SHO of the concerned area, shall inquire into this allegation and determine if the respondent no.3 is operating without the requisite permissions and approvals and, if that be so, take action against them in accordance with law.

9. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the



2026:DHC:1260-DB



above plea of the petitioner.

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

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**RAVINDER DUDEJA, J**

**FEBRUARY 12, 2026/ns/as**