



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

113

CRWP-4622-2024

Date of Decision: May 18, 2024

Twinkle and another

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Balwinder Singh Chahal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

SUDEEPTI SHARMA.J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, as filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners have sought issuance of directions upon the respondents No. 2 and 3, to ensure protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of respondent Nos. 4 to 9, and, also to restrain the said respondents from harassing the petitioners or interfering in their peaceful life.

2. The counsel for the petitioners state that since both the petitioners have attained the minimum age, as prescribed by statute, for solemnizing marriage, therefore, they have lawfully solemnized marriage, however, it has caused grievance to the respondent Nos. 4 to 9. Such grievance of the respondent Nos. 4 to 9 has made them apprehensive of danger to their lives and liberty and resultantly, it has constrained them to approach this court, to seek protection of their lives and liberty. The marriage certificate of the petitioners is available on record as Annexures P-3.



3. The petitioners have also submitted a representation dated 16.05.2024 (Annexure P-5) to the respondent No.2.
4. Notice of motion to the official respondent(s) only.
5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.
6. Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, the instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, District Yamuna Nagar, to decide the representation dated 16.05.2024 (Annexure P-5) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their lives and liberty is perceived. It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action against violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order shall not be understood to have expressed any opinion whatsoever by this court on the validity of the marriage of the petitioners.
7. Disposed of accordingly.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

May 18, 2024
sonia arora

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