

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

110

CRWP-3942-2020

DATE OF DECISION: 19.06.2020

SONIA KUMARI AND ANOTHER

... Petitioner (s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. K.S. Thakur, 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 respondents No. 4 to 6.

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

Learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn my attention to the representation dated 16.06.2020 (Annexure P-5) sent by the petitioners to respondent No. 2 - Superintendent of Police, Sonipat.

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 to respondent No. 2 –Superintendent of Police, Sonipat, to 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