

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

107

CRWP-10659-2022

Decided on : 14.11.2022

Joshna Lala and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate for 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 and 3 to provide protection of life and liberty to petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents.

Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Joshna Lala, aged about 32 years and petitioner No.2 – Tarsem Kumar, aged about 31 years, have got married on 04.11.2022, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 7. It has been further submitted that private respondents are threatening to interfere in the marital life of petitioners. Hence, petitioners are seeking protection in that regard and have approached this Court by way of filing the instant petition. They have also submitted a representation dated 05.11.2022 (Annexure P-6) to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Hisar, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

It is stated in the petition that petitioner No. 1 was earlier married to one Arun Kumar Lala in the year 2011 and out of this wedlock, no child was born. However, Arun Kumar Lala (first husband of petitioner No1) has expired on 20.07.2022.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (State).

In view of the above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Hisar, to look into the representation dated 05.11.2022 (Annexure P-6) *qua* threat perception and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that lives and liberty of 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.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 14, 2022

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*