

111.

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

CRWP-115-2022

Date of Decision: 07.01.2022

(Heard through VC)

KANISHA AND ANR

.... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate, for the petitioners.

JAISHREE THAKUR.J (Oral)

The petitioners claim themselves to be major. They have pleaded that they have married against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 8 and seek protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 8. They have placed on record marriage certificate (Annexure P-3) evidencing their marriage. Petitioner No.1 has also submitted a representation dated 06.01.2022 (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2, but no action has been taken so far.

Notice of motion to the official respondents only at this stage.

At this stage, Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, has put in appearance through the medium of video conferencing and accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

Let adequate copies of the paper book be supplied to him during the course of day.

Without commenting on the validity of the marriage allegedly performed by the petitioners and entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of this petition with directions to respondent No.2 to decide the representation submitted by petitioner No.1 (Annexure P-5) within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived.

It is made clear that this order shall not be taken to protect the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them.

At this stage, appearance has been caused by Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate, on behalf of respondent No.4 i.e. father of petitioner No.1 and seeks indulgence of this Court in allowing the parents to meet petitioner No.1.

This prayer is being objected to by the counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners on the ground that there are more than 50 persons searching for the young couple and in case, any meeting is allowed, it would tantamount to the live and liberty of the young couple being at risk.

In view of the statement given by the counsel for the petitioners that there is every apprehension that the parents of petitioner No.1 would disrupt the married life, this Court is not inclined to allow that prayer. Consequently, the prayer is declined.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

07.01.2022
sanjeev

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