



2025:AHC:182324

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**WRIT - C No. - 35622 of 2025**

Smt. Uma Bharti And Another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ashutosh Upadhyay
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

---

**Court No. - 78**

**HON'BLE NALIN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA, J.**

1. The petitioners have preferred this writ petition for a direction upon the respondents not to interfere in their married life and also for protection of their lives and liberty.

2. The petitioners claim that they are adults and living together out of their own freewill. It is stated that for the said reason, the private respondent and his other family members have got annoyed and there is serious danger to the lives of the petitioners as they are being threatened and harassed.

3. In support of their age, the petitioner no. 1 has brought on record her certificate-cum-marksheet of High School Examination, 2009 wherein the date of birth of the petitioner no.1 is shown as 10.6.1994 and petitioner no. 2 has brought on record his certificate-cum-marksheet of High School Examination, 2008 wherein his date of birth is shown as 2.4.1993. Thus, it appears from the record that both the petitioners are major. They have performed their marriage in the Arya Samaj, Prayagraj which is a registered body. They have also brought on record the complete online application for registration of their marriage.

4. The petitioners have averred in the writ petition that they are living as wife and husband. It is stated that they have apprehension of danger to their lives from the private respondent. In case this Court does not grant them protection, their lives may be endangered. It is

further submitted that as per best knowledge of the deponent, till date no first information report or any complaint has been lodged against them by any one.

5. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Standing Counsel for the State functionaries.

6. In view of the order proposed to be passed, there is no need to issue notice to private respondent. With the consent of learned counsel appearing for the parties, this writ petition is being disposed of finally at this stage in terms of the Rules of the Court.

7. The Supreme Court in a long line of decisions has settled the law that where a boy and a girl are major and they are living with their free will, then, nobody including their parents, has authority to interfere with their living together. Reference may be made to the judgements of the Supreme Court in the cases of **Gian Devi v. The Superintendent, Nari Niketan, Delhi and others**, (1976) 3 SCC 234; **Lata Singh v. State of U.P. and another**, (2006) 5 SCC 475; and, **Bhagwan Dass v. State (NCT of Delhi)**, (2011) 6 SCC 396, which have consistently been followed by the Supreme Court and this Court, as well as of this Court in **Deepika and another v. State of U.P. and others**, 2013 (9) ADJ 534. The Supreme Court in **Gian Devi** (supra) has held as under:

"7. ... Whatever may be the date of birth of the petitioner, the fact remains that she is at present more than 18 years of age. As the petitioner is sui juris no fetters can be placed upon her choice of the person with whom she is to stay, nor can any restriction be imposed regarding the place where she should stay. The court or the relatives of the petitioner can also not substitute their opinion or preference for that of the petitioner in such a matter."

8. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the petitioners are at liberty to live together and no person shall be permitted to interfere in their peaceful living. In case any disturbance is caused in the peaceful living of the petitioners, the petitioners shall approach the Superintendent of Police, Jaunpur i.e. the second

respondent, with a certified copy of this order, who shall provide immediate protection to the petitioners.

9. A liberty is granted to the private respondent that if the documents brought on the record are fabricated or forged, it will be open to him to file a recall application for recall of this order.

10. The petitioners undertake to get their marriage registered within a period of two months. If the petitioners could not get their marriage registered within the stipulated period herein above, the protection granted under this order shall stand automatically vacated.

11. It is made clear that this Court has not adjudicated upon the alleged marriage of the petitioners and this order in no way expresses opinion about the validity of their marriage.

12. However, this order would not come in way of investigation, if any, pending before the police authorities and the law will take its own course.

13. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition is **disposed of.**

**October 13, 2025**  
safi

**(Nalin Kumar Srivastava,J.)**