

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

116

CRWP-7046-2022

Date of Decision : July 25, 2022

ANCHAL AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present : Ms. Avneet Kaur, Advocate for the petitioners.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI. J. (Oral)

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in the present case they have got married with each other and the marriage certificate has been attached as Annexure P-3. She submitted that both the petitioners have attained the permissible age of marriage and the marriage was performed against the wishes of the private respondents and now there is an imminent threat from the private respondents to the petitioners and has, therefore, prayed for protection.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Davinder Bir Singh, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State of Punjab and Mr. C.M.Munjal, Advocate who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.4 to 8.

Mr. Munjal, Advocate has stated on specific instructions that respondents No.4 to 8 have never posed any threat to the petitioners and undertake not to pose any threat of any nature whatsoever. He has, however, stated that the Aadhar card attached by petitioner No.2, namely, Gurpreet Singh was forged and fabricated.

The learned State counsel has stated that he has no objection in case the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the police to consider the representation Annexure P-4 filed by the petitioners in accordance with law.

In view of the aforesaid position and also the specific assurance and undertaking given by the learned counsel for the respondents No.4 to 8, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to assess the threat perception of the petitioners and in case it is so required then appropriate steps be taken to ensure the lives of the petitioners that there is no harm caused to the lives of the petitioners on the ground that the marriage was opposed by the private respondents.

It is made clear that the scope of the present direction is confined only to the extent of protection of lives of the petitioners and it will not mean that it will create any embargo for taking any other action of any other nature against the petitioners if it is otherwise so warranted under the law.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

July 25, 2022

ajay-1

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