

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

108

**CRWP-10730-2022
Decided on : 15.11.2022**

Anmolpreet Kaur and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Vishal Mittal, Advocate for
Mr. Chirag Suri, 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 & 3, to provide protection of life and liberty to the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Anmolpreet Kaur, aged 19 years and petitioner No.2 – Samit Saini, aged 31 years, have got married on 10.11.2022, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 6. It has been submitted that the private respondents are threatening to interfere in the marital life of the petitioners. Hence, the 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 10.11.2022 (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. AS Sandhu, AAG, Punjab,

accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 (State).

5. At this stage, Ms. Sukhveer Kaur, Advocate, put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.4 – Gurnam Singh, and files her vakalatnama in Court, which is taken on record. She submits that respondent No.4 has no objection on the marriage of the petitioners.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur, to look into the representation dated 10.11.2022 (Annexure P-5), *qua* threat perception, and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents.

7. 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 15, 2022

J.Ram

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