

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

111

**CRWP-10821-2022
Decided on : 17.11.2022**

Bindu Rani and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Deepak Kumar Bartia, 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.1 to 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 – Bindu Rani, aged 31 years and petitioner No.2 – Anil Kumar, aged 31 years, have got married on 14.11.2022, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 8. 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 14.11.2022 (Annexure P-6) to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana,

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

5. At this stage, Mr. Khushkaran Kumar, Advocate, appears on behalf of respondents No.4 to 8, and files his vakalatnama in Court, which is taken on record. He submits that respondents have no objection to the marriage of the petitioners.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, to look into the representation dated 14.11.2022 (Annexure P-6), *qua* threat perception, and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that 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*