

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRWP-9302-2022**

Date of Decision: September 28, 2022

Taniya and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in the instant petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to respondents Nos. 2 to 4, to provide protection of life and liberty to the petitioners, who have married against wishes of private respondent Nos. 5 to 9.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Petitioner No.1 – Taniya, aged about 18 years and petitioner No.2 – Anuj Singla, aged about 32 years, have got married on 12.09.2022, against wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondent Nos. 5 to 9. It has been further submitted that private respondents are threatening and trying 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. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that petitioner No. 2 is aged about 32 years, whereas petitioner No. 1 is aged about 18 years only, therefore, to show his bonafide and to provide some financial security to petitioner No. 1 (Taniya), petitioner No. 2 is ready to deposit a sum of Rs. 50,000/- in the name of petitioner No. 1, within one

week from today.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ashish Yadav, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 4 (State).

6. In view of the above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 – Superintendent of Police, Ambala, District Ambala, to look into the representation dated 12.09.2022 (Annexure P-7), *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. While doing so, respondent No. 2 would also ensure/confirm about compliance of undertaking given by learned counsel for the petitioners that an amount Rs. 50,000/- deposited by petitioner No. 2 in the name of petitioner No. 1, within one week from today.

7. 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 28, 2022

P Kapoor

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