

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

113

CRWP-1998-2023

Decided on : 02.03.2023

Simranpreet Kaur and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Arun Kumar Gujjar, Advocate for
Mr. Vijay Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to official 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 – Simranpreet Kaur, aged about 24 years and petitioner No.2 – Mohit Poswal, aged about 28 years, have solemnized marriage on 26.02.2023, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 6. 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 26.02.2023 (Annexure P-5), which was sent through email dated 27.02.2023, to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion.
4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana, 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 to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, to look into the representation dated 26.02.2023 (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 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

March 02, 2023

J.Ram

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