



107

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

CRWP-8526-2024

Date of Decision: 04.09.2024

Ruby Devi and Another Petitioners
Versus

State of Punjab and Others Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Vikram Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioners Ruby Devi and Lakhvir Singh have filed present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of directions to respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 7, who are family members of petitioner No. 1.

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. As per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 1, Annexure P-1, her date of birth is 21.07.1989. On the other hand, as per Driving License, Annexure P-2 and Matriculation Examination Certificate, Annexure P-3 of petitioner No. 2, his date of birth is 16.04.1983. However, in Memo of Parties, date of birth of petitioner No.2 is wrongly mentioned as 18.03.2000. They had performed marriage on 01.09.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Parchin Pasupati Nath Shiv Mandir (Regd.), M.D.C., Sector-6, Panchkula, Haryana and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-4. Petitioners also moved representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, S.B.S. Nagar (Nawan Shehar), which is Annexure P-5. Petitioners had performed marriage

without consent and wishes of family members of petitioner No. 1 and as such they are receiving threats from respondents No. 4 to 7.

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 family 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 01.09.2024 (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.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

04.09.2024

lalit

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