

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

110

CRWP-720-2021

Date of decision : 27.01.2021

Anuradha and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Shakti Mehta, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 20.01.2021 at Shri Bala Ji Jyotish (Kendra) Temple, Mata Mansa Devi Market, Sector-4, Panchkula as per Hindu rites and ceremonies against the wishes of respondents No.4 and 5 and the petitioners are apprehending threat to their life and liberty at their instance.

During the Course of hearing, learned Counsel for the petitioners has made oral prayer that representation dated 21.01.2021 (Annexure P-4) was made to the Commissioner of Police, Panchkula as well as Superintendent of Police Yamuna Nagar but inadvertently Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar has not been impleaded as party to the present petition and he may be allowed to be impleaded as respondent No.6. The prayer is allowed and Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar is allowed to be impleaded as respondent No.6. The Registry is directed to make the requisite amendment in the memo of parties.

Copy of representation dated 21.01.2021 (Annexure P-4) made to the Commissioner of Police, Panchkula has been sent through e-mail by learned Counsel for the petitioner which is taken on record.

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.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that representation dated 21.01.2021 (Annexure P-4) was made to the Commissioner of Police, Panchkula as well as Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar seeking necessary protection but no action has been taken so far in the matter and prays for issuance of direction in this regard.

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.6-Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar to look into the grievances of the petitioners as set out in the petition and also expressed in the representation (Annexure P-4) 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, Yamuna Nagar for requisite compliance.

27.01.2021

Kothiyal

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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