

114 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3448-2023

Date of Decision: 13.04.2023

PINKY AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: Mr. Sanjay Khan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vishal Malik, DAG, Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (Oral)

This is a petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for directions to respondents Nos. 2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 10.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners have attained the age of majority. Petitioner No.1 is married with respondent No.4 and the marriage is still subsisting. Petitioner No.2 is married with respondent No.7 and their marriage is also subsisting. The petitioners are stated to be in living relationship and they are apprehending threats at the instance of respondent Nos. 4 to 10. He also referred to the Aadhar Cards (Annexures P-1 and P-2) of the petitioners to show that the petitioners are major.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the private respondents Nos. 4 to 10 are not accepting their relationship and they apprehend danger to their life and liberty from the private respondents and in

this regard they have already moved a representation dated 06.04.2023 (Annexure P-3) before respondent No. 2 -Superintendent of Police, District Rohtak.

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 *inter se* relationship of the parties, the petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No. 2 -Superintendent of Police, District Rohtak, to consider the representation dated 06.04.2023 (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)

13.04.2023

kv

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