

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

113

CRWP-3164-2024

Date of decision: 09.04.2024

Shahid and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Sarfaraj Anjum Mor, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, 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 and 3, to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners, who apprehend threat to their life at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 9, who are stated to be family their members.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1, aged about 21 years and petitioner No.2, aged about 18 years, got married on 04.04.2024, against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 9. Ever since then, the petitioners are being threatened with dire consequences by the private respondents. Resultantly, a representation dated 06.04.2024 (Annexure P-4) was also made to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, District Nuh for protection of their life and liberty but in vain. Learned counsel submits that he would be satisfied if directions are issued to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, District Nuh to look into their representation dated 06.04.2024 (Annexure P-4) and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. On a pointed query put to the learned counsel for the petitioners as to whether any criminal case registered against petitioner No.1 with respect to abduction/kidnapping/missing of petitioner No.2, he has replied in the negative.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with directions to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, District Nuh to look into the representation dated 06.04.2024 (Annexure P-4) *qua* the alleged threat perception and take necessary steps, as may be required, in accordance with law, to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents. 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.

09.04.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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