

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

CRWP No. 7174 of 2021

DATE OF DECISION :- August 02, 2021

Sandhya and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Union Territory Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present:- Mr. Mandeep, Advocate for the petitioners.

The case has been taken up through Video Conferencing.

It is stated that petitioner No.1 – Sandhya, aged about 22 years has got married with petitioner No.2 – Deepak, aged about 27 years against wishes of her family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 10, who are threatening to interfere in their marital life, as such to seek protection in that regard, they have approached this Court by way of filing the present petition. It is further stated that the petitioners had submitted a written representation to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh dated 29.7.2021 seeking protection, copy of the same being Annexure P-4 without evoking any response so far.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Anupam Bansal, APP U.T., Chandigarh has accepted notice on behalf of U.T. Chandigarh. He states that the local police had recorded statement of mother of petitioner No. 1 Sandhya namely Sarita

Mishra, who had stated that her husband Girdhar Mishra has expired and

her daughter Sandhya, aged about 23 years has got married with Deepak, aged about 27 years without her consent but she would not give any threat to them. Similar statement has been made by Rahul Mishra, brother of petitioner No. 1. Statements of Kishori Lal respondent no. 9 and Ganga Devi respondent No. 10 have also been recorded. Copies of such statements have been placed on record. However, learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that threat to the petitioners at the hands of private respondents is still there.

The petition is disposed of directing respondent No.2— Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh, to look into the representation Annexure P-4, assess threat perception to the petitioners and if he finds that some action in the matter is warranted, then the needful be done in accordance with law. However, this order shall not validate the marriage between the petitioners and shall not have any effect on any civil or criminal action to which the petitioners may be found liable, under the law.

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

August 02, 2021

p.singh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No