

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

CWP-32225-2019

Date of decision: 6.11.2019

Sonia Rani and another

.....Petitioners.

vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

Present: - Petitioners in person with
Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate for respondent No. 6.

.....

Sanjay Kumar, J. (ORAL)

This writ petition was filed seeking a direction to the police authorities of the State of Haryana not to harass the petitioners illegally at the behest of respondents No. 4 to 6, the relations of the first petitioner, Sonia Rani, who claims to have gotten married to the second petitioner, Tinku Jangra, against their wishes.

When the matter was taken up for hearing during the morning session, Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, learned counsel, entered appearance for respondent No. 6, Gulab Kharoud, grandfather of the first petitioner and stated that an attempt would be made to settle the matter amicably if the case is referred for mediation. The matter was accordingly passed over to enable the parties to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. Thereupon, the Mediator submitted a report stating that though the first petitioner's grandfather stated before him that he would arrange a proper marriage ceremony between the petitioners, the

first petitioner did not agree with this proposal as she apprehended danger in case she returned to her family. She further stated that she had taken an informed decision to marry the second petitioner. Thereupon, the first petitioner's grandfather and the other family members accompanying him stated before the Mediator that they were prepared to disown the first petitioner and would not maintain any contact with her. The grandfather also assured the Mediator that neither he nor the family members would harm the couple in any manner.

Despite the aforesaid assurances given by the family members of the first petitioner, Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, learned counsel representing the petitioners, would assert that there is a continuing threat to the lives and liberty of the petitioners in as much as the first petitioner's family members are vehemently opposed to their relationship.

The documents placed on record indicate that the first petitioner is over 22 years of age as her Aadhar card shows her date of birth as 13.3.1997. She would therefore be entitled to make her own choices and her family members cannot press upon her any decision which is not to her liking.

As the petitioners have already submitted representation dated 4.11.2019 to the Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, the second respondent herein, ventilating their apprehensions as to the threat that they face from the family members of the first petitioner, Sonia Rani, it would be appropriate that the police authorities concerned look into the same and take action, if necessary, to protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners. As the family members of the first petitioner have already gone on record to the effect that they now wish to disown her, it would be open

documents, passport, pan card and other belongings of the first petitioner which still remain in their custody.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

No order as to costs.

(SANJAY KUMAR)
JUDGE

6.11.2019

preeti

whether speaking/non speaking

yes/no

whether reportable/non reportable

yes/no