

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRWP-9327-2022**

Date of Decision: September 28, 2022

Anju and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Raman Kumar, Advocate,
for Mr. Rajeev K. Kapila, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

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 and 3, to provide protection of life and liberty to the petitioners, who have married against wishes of private respondent Nos. 4 to 7.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Petitioner No.1 – Anju, aged about 20 years and petitioner No.2 – Kulwinder Kumar, aged about 36 years, have got married on 26.09.2022, against wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondent Nos. 4 to 7. 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 36 years, whereas petitioner No. 1 is aged about 20 years only, therefore, to show his bonafide and to provide some financial security to petitioner No. 1 (Anju), 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. J.S. Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (State).

6. In view of the above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Hoshiarpur, to look into the representation dated 09.08.2022 and sent through courier on 26.09.2022 (Annexure P-5), *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/- is 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

Pk Kapoor

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

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**