

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

108

CRWP-11022-2022

Decided on : 22.11.2022

Simranjit Kaur and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sohan Singh Rana, 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. 1 to 3 to provide protection of lives and liberty of the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents.

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that contents mentioned in paragraph No. 12 of present petition may be ignored because petitioners have already performed marriage and mentioning of that “they are in a live-in relationship” is a typographical mistake.

Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Simranjit Kaur, aged about 26 years and petitioner No.2 – Jagpreet, aged about 27 years, have got married on 16.10.2022 against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No. 4 to 6. 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 31.10.2022

Batala, District Gurdaspur, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab, 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 –Senior Superintendent of Police, Batala, Gurdaspur, to look into the representation dated 31.10.2022 (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 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 22, 2022

Riya

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