

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

209

CRWP-4399-2020

Date of decision: 21.07.2020

Rajni and another	Versus	Petitioners
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Sukesh K. Jindal, Advocate for the petitioners
with petitioners in person.

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for respondents No.1 to 5-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

The petitioners, claiming themselves to be aged about 20 and 21 years respectively, have approached this Court seeking protection of their life and liberty on the averments that the petitioners performed marriage on 12.06.2020 at Sankat Mochan Shri Ram Darbar Sabha, Shri Ram Darbar Mandir, Nirmal Vihar, Karnal as per Hindu rites and ceremonies against the wishes of respondents No.6 to 11 and the petitioners are apprehending threat to their life and liberty at their instance.

Notice of motion was issued on 03.07.2020.

Mr. Sunil Bhorla, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.6 to 11 and undertakes to file his power of attorney in the registry in due course.

Vide order dated 03.07.2020, respondents No.2-Superintendent of Police, Panipat and respondent No.3-Superintendent

of Police, Rohtak were directed to look into the grievances of the petitioners as set out in the petition and also expressed in the representation dated 29.06.2020 (Annexure P-6) and take appropriate action for protection of their life and liberty as may be warranted by the circumstances.

Learned State counsel has filed status report by way of affidavit of Satish Kumar, HPS Deputy Superintendent of Police, Head Quarter, Panipat on behalf of respondents No.1, 2 and 4 through e-mail print out of which is taken on record.

In his affidavit, Satish Kumar, HPS Deputy Superintendent of Police, Head Quarter, Panipat has submitted that petitioner No.1 had given affidavit (Annexure R-2) to the effect that now they have no apprehension of life and personal liberty and do not require any police protection.

In compliance with order dated 03.07.2020, the petitioners are present through video conferencing and on being questioned by the Court have admitted having solemnized marriage and submitted that still there is threat perception to their life and personal liberty.

Learned State counsel has no objection if appropriate direction is given for providing requisite protection to the petitioners.

Without examining the question of legality and validity of the marriage and expressing any opinion thereon, the petition is disposed of with the directions to respondents No.2-Superintendent of Police, Panipat and respondent No.3-Superintendent of Police, Rohtak to look into the grievances of the petitioners as set out in the petition and also expressed in the representation dated 29.06.2020 (Annexure P-

6) and take appropriate action for protection of their life and liberty as may be warranted by the circumstances.

However, it is clarified that in case any criminal case has been/is registered against petitioner No.2, then nothing in this order shall be construed as a bar for taking of appropriate action by the police authorities against him in respect thereof in accordance with law.

Registry is directed to send a copy of this order along with copy of the petition and above-said representation to respondents No.2-Superintendent of Police, Panipat and respondent No.3-Superintendent of Police, Rohtak for requisite compliance.

21.07.2020

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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