

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

**CRWP-3338-2023
Date of decision: 17.04.2023**

Mohsina Begum and another **....Petitioners.**

Versus

State of Haryana and others **....Respondents.**

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Mohit Jasuja, and Mr. V.S. Saini, Advocate, for
Mr. Jatinder Singh Sodhi, Advocate, the petitioners.

.....

SANJIV BERRY, J.

This is a petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for directions to respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both petitioners are major and are living happily together. Both the petitioners have also appended their Aadhar Cards with regard to the age proof.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that both the petitioners belong to different religion and the family members of petitioner No. 2 are not happy with their relationship and the petitioners are apprehending threats to their lives at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7. He further submits that the petitioners have also moved a representation dated 15.03.2023 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No. 2-Superintendent of Police, District Bhiwani. But no action has been taken till date.

CRWP-3338-2023

-2-

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Vishal Malik, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State-respondents.

Without commenting on the validity of the marriage and the inter se relationship of the parties, the petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No. 2-Superintendent of Police, District Bhiwani, Haryana, to consider the representation dated 15.03.2023 (Annexure P-3) keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and if so warranted, take action, to ensure protection to the life and liberty of the petitioners, strictly in accordance with law.

This order is not to be construed as any opinion with regard to the age of the petitioners or factum or validity of their relationship in any civil or criminal proceedings nor the petitioners would be entitled for any protection against their arrest or continuance of any criminal proceedings, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

17.04.2023
preeti

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |