

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

120

CRWP No.250 of 2022

Date of Decision: January 12, 2022

Jaspreet Singh and another

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Gulati, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana

(Through Video Conferencing)

ANOOP CHITKARA J. (ORAL)

Fearing for their lives and liberty at the hands of the private respondents, the petitioners who claim to have married each other after attaining the permissible age for marrying, have come up before this Court seeking protection through the State, by invoking their fundamental rights of life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

Notices served upon the official respondents through the State's counsel. Given the nature of the order, this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of official respondents is required nor exists any requirement to issue notices to the private respondents.

Thus, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it shall be appropriate that the concerned Superintendent of Police, SHO, or any officer to whom such powers have been delegated or have been authorized in this regard, provide appropriate protection to the petitioners for one week from today. However, if the petitioners no longer require the protection, then it may be discontinued even before the expiry of a week. After that, the concerned officers shall extend the protection on day-to-day analysis of the ground realities or upon the oral or written request of the petitioners.

This protection is subject to the stringent condition that from the time such protection is given, the petitioners shall not go outside the boundaries of the

place of their residence, except for medical necessities, to buy household necessities, and bereavements in the families of the persons who are close to them. This restriction saves the petitioners from apprehended risk and ensures that the protection is not flaunted.

It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits. It is also clarified that this order is not a blanket bail in any FIR. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the interrogation of the petitioners is required in any cognizable case. It shall also be open for the petitioners to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception.

At this stage, Mr. Deepak K. Banta has joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing on behalf of the respondents No.4 to 6. He submits that parents of the girl wants to meet her.

Given above, concerned SHO shall convene a meeting on 14.01.2022, at a place other than the place where petitioners are presently residing, between the petitioners and respondents No.4 to 6 for one hour, subject to adhering the norms of Covid-19 pandemic.

It is also clarified that during the meeting one female police official shall also remain present.

Learned counsel for respondents No.4 to 6 on instructions submits that they shall not put any pressure, duress or any kind of intimidation to the petitioners during the course of the meeting, nor shall they yell upon them.

Petition is allowed to the extent mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

January 12, 2022
sonia arora

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