

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

116

CRWP-6274-2021

Date of decision : 08.07.2021.

Sanjana and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of UT, Chandigarh and others

.. Respondents

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Aditya Dassaur, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 16.

It is stated in the petition that the 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 06.07.2021 (Annexure P-5) sent by the petitioners to respondent No. 2—Commissioner of Police, UT, Chandigarh. He also contends that erroneously, the Commissioner of Police, UT, Chandigarh has been implicated as respondent No.2 instead of Senior Superintendent of Police, UT, Chandigarh.

At his oral request, respondent No.2 would be read as Senior Superintendent of Police, UT, Chandigarh.

Registry is directed to carry out necessary correction.

Issue notice to respondents No.1 to 3 only at this stage.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Vasundhra Dalal Anand, APP, UT, Chnadigarh, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3 and states that the statement of respondent No.4, who is the father of petitioner No.1, has been recorded wherein he has stated that he and his family members have accepted the marriage.

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–Senior Superintendent of Police, UT, Chandigarh, 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

July 08, 2021
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No