2023:PHHC:060479

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

113

CRWP-4109-2023
Decided on : 28.04.2023

Km Sneha Sharma and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sunil Kumar, 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 – Km Sneha Sharma, aged above 22 years and petitioner No.2 – Bharat Kumar, aged 26 years, have solemnized marriage on 25.04.2023, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 7. 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 25.04.2023 (Annexure P-4), to respondent No.2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

KAVITA NAIN
2023.04.28 14:44
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
order/judgment

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab, 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 respondent No.2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, to look into the representation dated 25.04.2023 (Annexure P-4), *qua* threat perception, and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that 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

April 28, 2023
k.nain

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

KAVITA NAIN
2023.04.28 14:44
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
order/judgment