

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

CRWP-3870-2023

Decided on : 24.04.2023

Simranjeet Kaur and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Shivam Kamboj Sirsa, 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.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 – Simranjeet Kaur, aged 23 years and petitioner No.2 – Satbir, aged 22 years, have solemnized marriage on 19.04.2023, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 & 5. 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.

3. On the very outset, counsel for the petitioners points out that in the representation dated 19.04.2023 inadvertently date has been mentioned as 12.04.2023 instead of 19.04.2023. They have submitted a representation

dated 19.04.2023 (Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 (State).

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad, to look into the representation dated 19.04.2023 (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.

7. 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

April 24, 2023

k.nain

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