

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

106

CRWP-12044-2022

Decided on : 22.12.2022

Jagriti Garg and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Rahul Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Viranjeet Singh Mahal, Addl. P.P, U.T. Chandigarh

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 – Jagriti Garg, aged 27 years and petitioner No.2 – Flt. Lt. Sagar Pradeep Verma, aged 26 years, have solemnized marriage on 04.12.2022, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 11. 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 14.12.2022 (Annexure P-7) to respondent No.2 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, Police Headquarters, Sector 9, Chandigarh, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion.
4. On advance notice, Mr. Viranjeet Singh Mahal, 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, Police Headquarters, Sector-9, Chandigarh, to look into the representation dated 14.12.2022 (Annexure P-7), *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 are 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 22, 2022

kavita nain

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