

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No.3441 of 2020
Date of Decision :05.06.2020

Dishu and another

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE

Present : Mr. G.S. Jagpal, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate for respondents No.4 and 5.
(The aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing
since the proceedings are being conducted in virtual Court)

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral):

A mandamus is prayed for commanding the official respondents
(respondents No.1 to 3) to protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners.

Petitioners Dishu and Vikash Kumar claim themselves to be major. They purport to have been in a relationship for quite some time. They intended to marry each other but their decision was resisted by the parents of petitioner no.1 and her family members. However, the petitioners alleged to have solemnized marriage on 02.06.2020, contrary to the wishes of the private respondents at Tridev Sanatan Dharm Prachar Smiti, M.D.C., Sector-4, Panchkula. Their grievance is that despite their persistent efforts to pacify or convince the private respondents they are not ready to accept their relationship or reconcile with their marriage. Rather, the petitioners have been threatened with dire consequences, and thus, they apprehend danger to their lives as also their implication in some false case. Thus, faced with this situation, they had represented to respondent No.2, vide representation dated 02.6.2020, to take necessary measures to secure their lives and liberty. But to no avail.

Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of respondents No.4 and 5, i.e. parents of petitioner No.1, and submits that petitioner No.1 had eloped with petitioner No.2 from her parental house and some cash and ornaments were also taken away by petitioner No.2 along with. And, he submits that respondents have already resorted to the remedies available to them in this regard.

Whereas, learned State counsel submits that let this petition be disposed of, at this stage only with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Yamunanagar (respondent No.2), who is alleged to be is in seizin of representation dated 02.06.2020 (Annexure P-5), submitted by the petitioners.

In the wake of the above, and without commenting upon the veracity of the allegations set out in the petition as also the validity of the marriage of the petitioners, the petition is disposed of with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Yamunanagar (respondent No.2), that, if any such representation, as indicated above, is pending, the same shall be considered forthwith and appropriate measures, as deemed necessary, shall be taken. As regards the allegations that is being made by the private respondents against petitioner No.2, suffice it to say, given the nature of the limited issue that arises in this petition, the same is not required to be examined by this Court.

A copy of this order be sent to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Yamunanagar (respondent No.2), so as to enable him to do the needful expeditiously.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

05.06.2020

Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No