

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

112

CRWP-10206-2020
Date of decision: 11.12.2020

Srishti Goel and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. S.K. Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioners
with petitioners in person.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

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

The petitioners, claiming themselves to be aged about 18 and 21 years respectively, have approached this Court seeking protection of their life and liberty on the averments that the petitioners, being major, performed marriage on 01.12.2020 at Mata Chintpurni Mandir, Ward No.2, Dabwali, District Sirsa as per Hindu rites and ceremonies against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 6 and the petitioners are apprehending threat to their life and liberty at their instance.

In support of the averments made in the petition, the petitioners have also enclosed photographs taken at the time of their marriage.

Notice of motion restricted to respondents No.1 to 3 only.

Pursuant to supply of advance copy, Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl. A.G., Haryana has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

At this stage, Mr. Chanchal K. Singla, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.4 and 5 and he undertakes to file his power of attorney in the registry.

Respondents No.4 and 5 have also appeared before this Court through video conferencing.

The petitioners, who are present through video conferencing, have on being questioned by the Court admitted having solemnized marriage and reiterated their prayer for protection as mentioned in the petition.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners states that a representation dated 01.12.2020 (Annexure P-5) was made to the Superintendent of Police, Sirsa seeking necessary protection but no action has been taken so far in the matter and prays for issuance of direction in this regard.

Learned Counsel for respondent No.4 and 5 submits that there is no threat to life and liberty of the petitioners from the side of respondents No.4 and 5.

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

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 respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Sirsa to look into the grievances of the petitioners as set out in the petition and also expressed in the representation (Annexure P-5) 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 respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Sirsa for requisite compliance.

11.12.2020

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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