

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

120

CRWP-10908-2022

Decided on : 18.11.2022

Jyoti @ Joyti and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. S. N. 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 lives and liberty of the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents.

Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Jyoti @ Joyti, aged about 18 years and petitioner No.2 – Dinesh Kumar, aged about 25 years, have got married on 15.11.2022 against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No. 4 to 10. It has been further submitted that private respondents are threatening to interfere in the matrimonial 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 15.11.2022, (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2 –Superintendent of Police, Jind, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

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).

On advance notice, Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate, appears on behalf of respondent No.4-Satish (father of petitioner No. 1-Jyoti @ Joyti) and files his vakalatnama which is taken on record.

He submits that although respondent No. 4 has no objection to the marriage performed by his daughter with petitioner No. 2-Dinesh Kumar, yet he desires to meet his daughter once.

In view of the above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 –Superintendent of Police, Jind, to look into the representation dated 15.11.2022 (Annexure P-5), *qua* threat perception and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that lives and liberty of petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondent.

It is further directed that in case respondent No. 4-Satish makes any genuine request to express his desire to meet his daughter i.e. petitioner No. 1-Jyoti @ Joyti, same may be considered, as per the situation.

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 18, 2022

Riya

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