

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

120

CRWP-11138-2022

Decided on : 24.11.2022

Shivani and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Sunita Nambiar, 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 lives and liberty of the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents.

Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Shivani, aged about 21 years and petitioner No.2 – Vipin Kumar, aged about 21 years, have got married on 23.11.2022 against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No. 4 to 7. 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 23.11.2022 (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2 –Senior Superintendent of Police, U.T. Chandigarh, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Anupam Bansal, Addl. PP, U.T., Chandigarh, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (State). He points out that petitioners performed their

marriage on 23.11.2022 and representation qua threat perception was addressed to respondent No. 2 Senior Superintendent of Police, U.T. Chandigarh, on the same date i.e. 23.11.2022 and present petition was also filed on 23.11.2022 before this Court. Thus, averment in the petition that respondents are not looking into the representation dated 23.11.2022 is absolutely false on the face of it.

He also submits that both the petitioners have given fake address in the present petition because as per verification done by U.T. police, they had left the said place about six months back and in this regard, statements of owner of the said house, namely Surjit Singh as well as tenant-Nagender Kumar, who is already residing there, were got recorded wherein they also mentioned that petitioners had left the house six months back.

In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the present petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 24, 2022

Riya

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