

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

113

**CRWP-12010-2022
Decided on : 21.12.2022**

Monika Dutt and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Pushp Jain, 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 and 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 – Monika Dutt, aged about 26 years and petitioner No.2 – Deepak, aged about 30 years, have solemnized marriage on 13.12.2022, 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 13.12.2022 (Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2 –Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar City, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

It is pertinent to mention here that in memo of parties, respondent No.2 is described as, “Senior Superintendent of Police, District

Jalandhar (Rural)”, whereas, representation dated 13.12.2022 (Annexure P-5), has been sent to “Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar City”.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab, 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 to look into the representation dated 13.12.2022 (Annexure P-5), *qua* threat perception, and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that 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 21, 2022

J.Ram

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