

**118**

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

CRWP No. 7028 of 2021  
Date of Decision: 29.07.2021

Tejo Devi and others

-Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

-Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)**

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

Petitioners have approached this Court for issuance of appropriate directions to respondents No.1 to 4 in the context of protecting their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by private respondents No.5 to 9.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.3 solemnized love marriage with respondent No.5 against the wishes of family members of respondent No.5 on 07.07.2021. Petitioner No.3 and respondent No.5 are major. Thereafter, they filed a protection petition in the Court of Sessions Judge, Fatehabad, but the same was withdrawn on

08.07.2021. Thereafter, petitioner No.3 and respondent No.5 came to District Courts, Kaithal and were in the process of filing protection petition at Kaithal on 19.07.2021 where family members of respondent No.5 along with police personnels of Rajasthan came and took away respondent No.5 forcibly.

Now the petitioners feel constant threat at the hands of respondents No.6 to 9. Petitioners also feel reasonable apprehension that respondent No.5 may involve them in some false case.

Precisely, for the grievance in question, petitioners filed a representation before respondent No.2 on 23.07.2021.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajat Gautam, D.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4.

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of calling upon any response from the respondents, as no order prejudicial to the interest of any party is being passed.

At this stage, without embarking upon merits of the case and without commenting upon validity of marriage or otherwise, this petition is disposed with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the threat perception of the

petitioners arising out of representation dated 23.07.2021 and decide the same by devising his own ways and means to ascertain the truth.

This Court has not commented upon complicity of anyone at this stage.

Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to pass appropriate order in accordance with law. If any criminal prosecution is found to have been launched by respondent No.5 against anyone, then this order shall not be construed to be an impediment for proceedings against the accused in accordance with law.

It would be appreciated if the needful is done preferably within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

July 29, 2021

Jyoti Sharma

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

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