

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

(148)

CWP-13939-2019

Date of Decision: May 23, 2019

Veshnavi Sharma and another

.. Petitioners

Versus

Union Territory and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Rubal Garg, Advocate, for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(ORAL)

The petitioners are seeking a direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty as they apprehend danger from respondents No. 4 to 7.

It is stated in the petition that both the petitioners are major and the date of birth of petitioner No.1 is 02.03.2001 and date of birth of petitioner No.2 is 22.05.1990 and they have solemnized their marriage on 20.05.2019 and respondents No.4 to 7 were opposed to the marriage of petitioner No.1 when she informed that she intends to marry petitioner No.2. Apprehension has been expressed by the petitioners that respondents No. 4 to 7 may cause physical harm to them.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn my attention to the representation dated 20.05.2019 (Annexure P-5) sent by the petitioners to respondent No. 2- the Senior Superintendent of Police, Sector 34, Chandigarh for protecting their life and liberty.

Issue notice to respondents No. 1 to 3.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Ashima Mor, Standing Counsel for U.T., Chandigarh, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3.

Without making any observation on the merits of the case, especially in respect of the marriage performed by the petitioners, a direction is issued to respondents No.2 and 3-the Senior Superintendent of Police, Sector 34, Chandigarh and SHO, Police Station Sector 34, Chandigarh that in case the petitioners approach them for the grant of protection for their life and liberty as they are apprehending threats at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7, it may be ensured that the life and liberty of the petitioners is not compromised in any manner.

It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as an approval of this Court about the marriage of the parties and no opinion with regard to the validity of the marriage has been expressed in this order.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

May 23, 2019
harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No