

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

105

CRWP-3936-2020

DATE OF DECISION: 19.06.2020

SURAKSHA SHARMA AND ANOTHER

... Petitioner (s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Ms. Anju Rathore, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioners are seeking a direction to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty as they apprehend danger from respondent No.4.

It is stated in the petition that petitioners have performed their marriage, which is against the will of private respondent and they have apprehension that the private respondents might cause physical harm to them.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that they had approached the official respondents and they shall be making a representation to respondent No.2.

Issue notice to respondents No. 1 to 3 only.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3.

Keeping in view the mandate of Supreme Court in the case of “Lata Singh V. State of U.P. and another”, JT 2006 (6) SC 173, the present petition is disposed of with a direction that in the event of petitioner making a representation to respondent No. 2 – Commissioner of Police, Ambala, he shall look into the matter and take appropriate action in accordance with law to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.

It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as a stamp 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.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

19.06.2020.

SwarnjitS

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