

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-1970-2024
Date of decision: 01.03.2024

SAVITRI SAINI AND ANOTHERPetitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: - Mr. Harjinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 6.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, both major, have solemnized their marriage on 26.02.2024 according to Vedic rites and ceremonies. He also refers to the marriage certificate dated 26.02.2024 (Annexure P-3). He also referred to the Aadhar Cards (Annexure P-1 and Annexure P-2) of the petitioners to show that the petitioners are major.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the private respondents No.4 to 6 are not accepting the marriage of the petitioners and they apprehend danger to their life and liberty from the private respondents and in this regard they have already moved a representation dated 26.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) before respondent No.2- The Superintendent of Police, District Mewat.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State-respondents.
6. Without commenting on the validity of the marriage of the parties, the petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.2- The Superintendent of Police, District Mewat, to consider the representation dated 26.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) 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.
7. This order is not to be construed as any opinion with regard to the age of the petitioners or factum or validity of their marriage 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

01.03.2024
kanika

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |