



CRWP-7755-2024

-1-

130

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

CRWP-7755-2024

Date of Decision: August 12, 2024

Saliya Khan and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Raghav Bali, Advocate
for the petitioners.

.....

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for directing respondents No.2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondents No.5 to 8 as well as their henchmen/relatives and further more respondents No.3 and 4 and their officials be directed not to harass and interfere in the peaceful lives of the petitioners and not to raid their houses time and again.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that petitioner No.1 is more than 17 years of age whereas petitioner No.2 is more than 20 years and both of them have married according to Muslim Rites by performing Nikahnama against the wishes of respondents no.4 to 9 and have sought protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents no.5 to 8. Their photographs and marriage certificate evidencing their marriage are on record as Annexures P-3 and P-4. The petitioners have



submitted a representation, dated 05.08.2024 (Annexure P-5) to respondent no.2.

Notice of motion to respondents no.1 to 4-State only.

On asking of the Court, Mr.Sumit Jain, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State.

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, Panipat, to decide the representation (Annexure P-5) of petitioner No.1 and grant protection to the petitioners, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived. It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order would not be understood having expressed any opinion whatsoever by this Court on the validity of the marriage of the petitioners.

August 12, 2024
meenuss

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |