

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-8204-2021

Date of Decision: 31.08.2021

Depty and another

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Through Video Conferencing

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to provide police protection to the petitioners and also not to interfere with the life and liberty of the petitioners.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that it is a case where the petitioner No.1 (girl) is 35 years of age and the petitioner No.2 (boy) is 37 years of age and both of them are married with other persons but with respect to their marriage, divorce petition is already pending before the competent Court but no decree has been passed as yet. He submitted that however the petitioners knew each other for long time and they started to live with each other out of their own choice. He submitted that both the

petitioners being fully matured and adults have right to live at the place of their own choice and with the person of their own choice. However, the private respondents had been repeatedly threatening the petitioners that they will be killed. He referred to para No.7 of the petition wherein on 15.08.2021 at 2.00 P.M a person from other side introduced himself as Thanedar Jagmal from Police Station Narayangarh and stated that a complaint has been received against them and asked them to come on the next date and in the meantime he gave phone to respondent No.10, namely Manoj @ Prince who in the presence of the aforesaid Jagmal Thanedar threatened the petitioner No.1 that he will get the petitioner No.2 killed within two hours. He further submitted that the petitioner No.1 is having the said audio recording and can produce it as and when required. He submitted that there is an imminent threat from the private respondents especially respondent No.10 to the life of the petitioners and the police of Police Station Narayangarh is also helping the respondent No.10 in this regard. He further submitted that three different representations were given to three different SPs of Karnal, Ambala and Yamuna Nagar because the petitioner No.1 belongs to District Ambala but is now staying in Karnal and at present both the petitioners are staying at Karnal.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Manchanda, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4 only and states that he has no objection in case the representation of the petitioners is decided by the concerned police authority in accordance with law.

In view of the above, this Court is satisfied that the present

petition can be disposed of with a direction to the respondent No.2 to decide the representation of the petitioners after assessing the threat perception of the petitioners and to take further necessary action in accordance with law.

Since the subject matter pertains to three different Districts i.e. Karnal, Yamuna Nagar and Ambala, the Superintendent of Police, Karnal shall also coordinate with the Superintendent of Police of Ambala and Yamuna Nagar in this regard before taking a decision.

Let the representation of the petitioners be decided as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of one weeks from the date of the receipt of the copy of this order.

Disposed of accordingly.

31.08.2021

rakesh

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE**

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