

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

114

**CRWP-10944-2022
Decided on : 21.11.2022**

Pooja Rani and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate and
Mr. Devansh Khanna, 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 lives and liberty of the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents. Both the petitioners and private respondents are residents of village Sanwar, District Charkhi Dadri, which in fact was earlier in District Bhiwani.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Pooja Rani, aged about 30 years and petitioner No.2 – Krishan, aged about 22 years, have got married on 10.11.2022, 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 16.11.2022 (Annexure P-6) to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Charkhi Dadri, District Charkhi Dadri, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion.

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

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

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Charkhi Dadri, District Charkhi Dadri, to look into the representation dated 16.11.2022 (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.

6. 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 21, 2022

J.Ram

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