

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

112

**CRWP-7830-2022
Date of decision :18.08.2022**

Abhi and another

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana & Others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present:- Mr. Madan Sandhu, Advocate, for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 to 5, to provide protection of life and liberty to the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents No.6 to 10.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Petitioner No.1 – Abhi, aged 18 years (daughter of Late Sh. Subhash Chand) and petitioner No.2 – Rahul, aged 28 years, have got married on 12.08.2022, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.6 to 10. It has been further submitted that the private respondents are threatening to interfere in the marital life of the petitioners. Hence, they are seeking protection in that regard and have approached this Court by way of filing the instant petition.

3. In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No.6 to 10, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 12.08.2022 (Annexure P-7) to the Superintendent of Police, District Kaithal, The Superintendent of Police, District Jhajjar, The SHO Police Station Kitthana, Kaithal, The SHO, Jhajjar, City Jhajjar (respondent Nos.2 to 5),

wherein, all the apprehension to their lives has been expressed.

4. Notice of motion.
5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. A.G, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 (State).
6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Kaithal as private respondents are residents of District Kaithal to look into the representation dated 12.08.2022 (Annexure P-7) *qua* threat perception, if any, and take necessary steps, if any required, in accordance with law, to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents. However, this direction will not validate the marriage said to have taken place between the parties and will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

August 18, 2022
anil

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned :</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>