

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

128

CRWP-3599-2023 (O&M)

Decided on :17.04.2023

Savita and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. 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. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in paragraphs No. 10 and 14 of the present petition, date of marriage and date of representation have wrongly been mentioned as 25.11.2020, instead of 13.03.2023 and 01.04.2023 respectively.

He further submits that petitioner No.1- Savita, aged about 21 years and petitioner No.2 – Sandeep, aged about 28 years, have got married on 13.03.2023 against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No. 4 to 14. It is first marriage of both the petitioners. 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 01.04.2023 (Annexure P-4), to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Nuh, Haryana, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

Notice of motion.

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

5. In view of the above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Nuh, Haryana, to look into the representation dated 01.04.2023 (Annexure P-4), *qua* threat perception and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that 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.

7. Disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

17.04.2023

Riya

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