



110

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-9273-2024

Date of Decision: 25.09.2024

Paramjeet Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr.Rahul Noorie, Advocate for petitioners

Mr.Kewal Singh, Addl.A.G., Punjab
for respondents no.1 to 3**Amarjot Bhatti, J.**

1. Petitioners-Paramjeet Kaur and Santokh Singh 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 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 14.

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. As per Aadhaar Card and Matriculation Examination Certificate cum Detailed Mark-sheet of petitioner No. 1 (Annexures P-1 and P-2, respectively), her date of birth is 10.9.2006. On the other hand, as per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 2, Annexure P-3, his date of birth is 9.10.2000. They had performed marriage on 18.9.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Dasvi, Village Singha Devi, Tehsil Kharar, District Mohali (Regd. No. 178) is Annexure P-4 and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-6. In compliance with order dated

23.9.2024 passed by this Court, petitioner no.1 has filed affidavit in Court today in support of her aforesaid date of birth and her marriage with petitioner no.2. The said affidavit is taken on record. Petitioner No. 1 also moved representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, District Ferozepur, Punjab which is Annexure P-5. Petitioners had performed marriage without consent and wishes of family members/relatives of petitioner No. 1 and as such they are receiving threats from respondents No. 4 to 14.

3. Notice of motion to respondents no.1 to 3 only at this stage.

4. On asking of this Court, Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents no.1 to 3. Complete copy of paper-book 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/relatives of petitioner No. 1, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 14. It is duty of police to protect life and liberty of petitioners. Therefore, respondents No.2 is directed to consider representation of petitioner No. 1 dated 18.9.2024 (Annexure P-5) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 14, 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.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

25.09.2024
MFK

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>