

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

109

**CRWP-12051-2022 (O&M)
Decided on :22.12.2022**

Reenu and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jarnail Singh Saneta, 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.

Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Reenu, aged about 21 years and petitioner No.2 – Harneet Singh, aged about 25 years, have got married on 19.12.2022 against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No. 4 to 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.2- Harneet Singh was earlier married to one Sonia. But, said marriage was dissolved by way of decree of divorce passed by the competent Court on 12.09.2022 (Annexure P-4). 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 19.12.2022 (Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (State).

In view of the above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, to look into the representation dated 19.12.2022 (Annexure P-5) *qua* threat perception and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that lives and liberty of petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents.

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

Riya

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