



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

CRWP-8278-2024

Date of Decision: 29.08.2024

Heena and Another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

..... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Manpreet Singh Bhatti, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.(oral)

1. Petitioners Heena and Vikas Kumar have filed present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing respondents No. 2 and 3 not to harass petitioners illegally at the behest of respondents No. 4 to 7 and also directing respondents No. 2 and 3 to restrain respondents No. 4 to 7 from interfering in married life of petitioners and also to protect their life and liberty from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7, who are family members of petitioner No. 1.

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. Petitioner No.1 is aged about 26 years, copy of her Aadhar Card is Annexure P-1. Petitioner No. 2 is also aged about 35 years, copy of his Aadhar Card is Annexure P-2. They had performed marriage on 27.08.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Prachin Gugga Madi Ramkrishana Mandir, Sector 19-D, Chandigarh, is Annexure P-4. Petitioners also moved representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, SAS Nagar (Mohali), which is Annexure P-5. Petitioners had performed marriage without

consent and wishes of parents/family members of petitioner No.1. Petitioners are receiving threats from respondents No. 4 to 7, who are family members of petitioner No. 1.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of this Court, Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State. Complete copy of paperbook along with supporting documents is already supplied.

5. Considering nature of litigation, no purpose would be served by serving notice to private respondents.

6. I have considered the facts narrated in petition, according to which both petitioners are major and they have performed marriage against wishes of parents of petitioner No. 1, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7. It is duty of police to protect life and liberty of petitioners. Therefore, respondents No. 2 and 3 are directed to consider representation of petitioners dated 27.08.2024 (Annexure P-5) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7, considering threat perception, with further direction to maintain their privacy and dignity.

7. Aforesaid protection order will have no bearing on legality and validity of marriage and it will not protect them in case there is any violation of law or pending legal proceedings.

8. Petition is accordingly disposed of.

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

29.08.2024

lalit

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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