



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

110

**CRWP No. 5981 of 2024
DATE OF DECISION :- 26.06.2024**

Sejal and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the petitioners.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioners are seeking issuance of directions to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty at the hands of respondent Nos. 4 to 8.
2. Notice of motion to respondents Nos. 1 to 3 (i.e. official respondents).
3. On the asking of the Court, Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.
4. As per petitioners, the marriage between petitioner No. 1 and son of petitioner No. 2 Mohit, was solemnized on 29.07.2023 against the wishes of respondent Nos. 4 to 8, who happen to be the family members/relative of the petitioners.
5. Petitioner No. 1 and son of petitioner No. 2 have claimed themselves to be major relying upon their Aadhar Cards indicating that date



of birth of petitioner No.1-Sejal is 14.01.2003 and son of petitioner No. 2 -Mohit is 05.09.1996.

6. Without commenting on the legality and validity of the marriage as also the merits of contentions raised in the petition, I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No. 2 Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra to look into the representation dated 22.06.2024 (Annexure P-4) stated to have been submitted by petitioner No. 1-Sejal & pass appropriate orders thereupon within two weeks from today.

7. Keeping in view the fact that both the petitioners claim to have married against the wishes of their family(s), I direct that if possible, respondent No. 2 Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra may call a meeting of the petitioners as well as the parents of both the petitioners and their other concerned family members in his/her presence so that the parties may endeavour to resolve their dispute(s) and live amicably.

8. Liberty is reserved in favour of private respondents to seek recall of this order on showing sufficient cause.

9. However, if the petitioners are found to have been involved in any other case, then this order shall not preclude the competent authority from taking lawful action against the petitioners.

10. The petition stands disposed off. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

26.06.2024
P.Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No