

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

116

CRWP-8985-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 13.09.2023

Neha Azad Sharma and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Ms. Manpreet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Sunil Kumar Rana, Advocate for the petitioners.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 to 14.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners are major and have married against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 14 and have sought protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger at the hands of respondents No.4 to 14. The certificate and photographs evidencing their marriage are on record as Annexures P-3 and P-4, respectively. The petitioners have submitted a representation dated 07.09.2023(Annexure P-5) to respondent No. 2-Superintendent of Police, Kaithal.

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3 only.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. AG Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 only.

At this stage, Mr. Vikas Lochab, Advocate, appears and files his power of attorney on behalf of respondent Nos. 4 (father of petitioner No.1), and submits that respondent No.4, wants to have an interaction with petitioner No.1. The power of attorney is taken on record.

As requested, respondent No.4 is allowed to interact with her daughter-petitioner No.1 in the Court itself.

Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent No. 2-Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, to decide the representation dated 07.09.2023(Annexure P-5) of the petitioners and grant protection to them, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived.

It is made clear that this order shall not be taken to protect the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

13.09.2023
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No