

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

112

**CRWP-11643-2022  
Decided on : 13.12.2022**

Tamnna and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of UT, Chandigarh and others

. . . Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

PRESENT: Mr. Siddarth, 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.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Tamnna, aged about 25 years and petitioner No.2 – Sonu, aged about 25 years, have solemnized marriage on 10.11.2022, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 6. 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 05.12.2022 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, UT, Chandigarh, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

It is pertinent to mention here that in the petition date of representation has been wrongly mentioned as 11.11.2022, however, in

actual representation dated 05.12.2022 was sent through registered post on 06.12.2022.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On advance notice, Mr. Ankur Bali, Addl. PP, UT Chandigarh, puts in appearance and 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 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, UT Chandigarh, to look into the representation dated 05.12.2022 (Annexure P-4), which was sent through registered post on 06.12.2022, *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**

**December 13, 2022**

*J.Ram*

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