

CRWP-8869-2022

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRWP-8869-2022**

Date of Decision: September 14, 2022

Aarti and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, DAG, Haryana,
for respondent Nos. 1, 3 and 5.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab,
for respondent Nos. 2 and 4.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in the instant petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to official respondent Nos. 3 to 5, not to harass the petitioners at the instance of private respondents No. 6 and 7 and further to direct respondent No. 3 to provide protection of life and liberty to the petitioners, who have married against wishes of private respondent Nos. 6 and 7.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Petitioner No.1 – Aarti, aged about 21 years and petitioner No.2 – Vishal Singh, aged about 23 years, have got married on 09.09.2022, against wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondent Nos. 6 and 7. It has been further submitted that private respondents are threatening and trying to

CRWP-8869-2022

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. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Rahul Mohan, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1, 3 and 5, whereas Mr. J.S. Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2 and 4.

5. In view of the above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 3 – Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, and respondent No. 4 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Nawanshahar, to look into the representation dated 09.09.2022 (Annexure P-4), *qua* threat perception, if any, and take necessary steps, if any required, in accordance with law, to ensure that life and liberty of the petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of private respondents. However, this direction will not validate the marriage said to have taken place between petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 and will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 14, 2022

Pkapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**