



112

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

CRWP-8727-2024

Date of Decision:- 09.09.2024

Nandini Grover and Another

....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Parvesh Sachdeva, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioners Nandini Grover and Sanchit have filed present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing official respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No. 4 and 5.

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 24.10.2005. On the other hand, as per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 2, Annexure P-2, his date of birth is 25.03.2003. They had performed marriage on 25.08.2024. Photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-3. Petitioners also moved representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, which is Annexure P-4. Petitioners had performed marriage without consent and wishes of parents of petitioner No. 1 and as such they are receiving threats from respondents No. 4 and 5.

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. As per the contents of petition, both petitioners are married. However, there is no marriage certificate attached with petition. There are only two photographs in which petitioners have put garland to each other in a temple. However, it is duty of police to protect life of petitioners. Therefore, respondents No. 2 and 3 are directed to protect life of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 4 and 5, 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

09.09.2024

lalit

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