

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

Sr.No.125

CRWP No.7327 of 2022

Date of Decision: 01st August, 2022.

Mehajabin Begum & Another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. Robin Lohan, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

* * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

By way of this petition, both the petitioners have approached this Court for seeking the relief of the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehend threat to the same at the hands of respondents No.4 to 7 because they (petitioners) have solemnized their marriage against the wishes of these respondents. It has also been mentioned in this petition that a representation (Annexure P-6) has already been moved to respondent No.2 in this regard.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, who has appeared on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case in pursuance of the copies of the instant petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance, accepts the notice on behalf of these respondents.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners restricts his prayer to the issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 to look into and take appropriate action on the said representation of the petitioners, i.e. Annexure P-6.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

Keeping in view the above-discussed limited prayer as made by learned counsel for the petitioners and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the legality and validity of the marriage as stated to have been solemnized between the petitioners, respondent No.2-Commissioner of Police, Panchkula, is hereby directed to look into the said representation of the petitioners (Annexure P-6) only to the extent so far as it pertains to their prayer qua the protection of their lives and liberty and if it is found that the petitioners genuinely deserve the said protection, then to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

It is further clarified that this order shall also not be construed to be a shield to the petitioners against any other action/proceedings already initiated or intended/contemplated to be initiated against them by any competent authority/person on account of the said marriage and permissible under the relevant provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

01.08.2022.
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes
Whether Reportable?	No

