

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

111

CRWP-340-2023

Decided on : 13.01.2023

Vijay Singh and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Aanand Kumar Maurya, 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.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Vijay Singh, aged about 21 years and petitioner No.2 – Ritika, aged above 18 years, have solemnized marriage on 09.01.2023, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 6, at Mata Mansa Devi Mandir Complex, and accordingly, a marriage certificate dated 09.01.2023 (Annexure P-3), has been issued by Priest (Pandit) of Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir Society.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that it is the first marriage of both the petitioners. 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 09.01.2023 (Annexure P-4), to respondent No.2 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, UT Chandigarh, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Shashank Bhandari, Addl. PP, UT Chandigarh, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 (UT Chandigarh).

6. At this stage, Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of respondent No.4 (elder sister of petitioner No.2), and files his vakalatnama in Court, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

7. Learned counsel for respondent No.4, points out that petitioner No.5 – Shivraj (father of petitioner No.2) though impleaded as respondent in the present petition, had expired way back about 15 years back, and respondent No.6 – Sulendari Devi, who is biological mother of petitioner No.2, has already re-married to someone else, and living separately. Therefore, petition filed against both aforesaid respondents No.5 & 6, is misconceived.

8. Be that as it may, 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 09.01.2023 (Annexure P-4), *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.

9. 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**

January 13, 2023
J.Ram/kavita

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