

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

102

CRWP-10805-2022

Decided on : 17.11.2022

Amrik Singh and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Nitin Rathore, Advocate for
Mr. B.S. Bhalla, 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 respondent No.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 – Amrik Singh, aged 22 years and petitioner No.2 – Manpreet Kaur, aged 18 years, have got married on 09.11.2022, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 & 5. It has been submitted that the private respondents are threatening to interfere in the matrimonial 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 11.11.2022 (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2 – Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion.

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

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

5. At this stage, Mr. Varinder Kumar Sandhir, Advocate, appears on behalf of respondents No.4 & 5, and files his vakalatnama in Court, which is taken on record. He submits that petitioner No.2 has been projected as major, but in fact, she is minor.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, to look into the representation dated 11.11.2022 (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 17, 2022

J.Ram

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