

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

**CRWP No. 11040 of 2021
Date of Decision: 24.11.2021**

Sneha and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR

Present: Mr. D.S.Nigha, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Pardeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. M.S.Dua, Advocate for respondents No. 4 and 5.

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. Both the petitioners entered into a wedlock. A perusal of the matriculation(s) certificate, placed today, before this Court by the learned counsel for the petitioners, reveals that at the time of their entering into a wedlock, they held the apposite legal capacity.

2. In the petition, it is alleged that co-respondents No. 4 and 5, are adverse to the afore marriage, solemnized *inter se* the petitioners. It is also alleged that, hence threats are being meted by the afore co-respondents, to the petitioners. Therefore, the petitioners moved this Court for protection, being granted to them with respect to their life and liberty, as is alleged to be interfered with, by the afore meted threats to them, by co-respondents No. 4 and 5.

3. In the petition, there exists no tangible and concrete evidence, with respect to the gravity of the threats, as are alleged to be meted by

co-respondents No. 4 and 5 to the petitioners. For the lack of the afore tangible material(s) existing on record, this Court does not deem it fit to make, any direction upon co-respondents No. 1 to 3, to grant police protection to them, rather for negating the threats, as are alleged to be meted to them, hence by co-respondents No. 4 and 5. Nonetheless, it is open to the petitioners to press for a decision, in accordance with law, being made upon their representation, as becomes appended with the petition, as Annexure P-5.

4. Consequently, respondents No. 4 and 5 are directed, to through a speaking order, to be made within three weeks hereafter, make a decision on Annexure P-5. Furthermore, directions are also meted, upon the authorities concerned, that before theirs proceeding, to make a decision on Annexure P-5, they shall summon the petitioners, to enable them, to adduce evidence with respect to the gravity, and, magnitude of the threats, as are alleged to be meted to them, by co-respondents No. 4 and 5. In case a decision adversarial to the petitioner is made, thereupon, and, unless the respondents concerned, undertake to not henceforth make any threats to the co-petitioners, thereupon, the petitioners may recourse the appropriate remedies.

5. Co-respondents No. 4 and 5 are the parents of co-petitioner No. 1. Mr. M.S.Dua, Advocate puts in appearance on behalf of respondents No. 4 and 5, and tenders his vakalatnama, and, submits that on instructions, meted to him, that henceforth the afore shall not interfere with the married life of the co-petitioners. He further submits that, the afore co-respondents No. 4 and 5, are only desirous of a meeting being arranged *inter se* them with co-petitioner No. 1, rather for facilitating theirs becoming awakened,

with respect to her well being, and, happiness, in the matrimonial company of co-petitioner No. 2.

6. The afore prayer is not opposed by the learned counsel for the petitioners. Consequently, co-respondent No. 3 is directed to arrange a consensual meeting at a convenient place, hence *inter se* co-petitioner No. 1, and, co-respondents No. 4 and 5. The afore meeting be positively be ensured to be arranged, within one week.

7. With the afore direction, the petition stands disposed of.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

November 24, 2021
Gurpreet

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