



107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-9387- 2024
Date of Decision:30.09.2024

Mili and another	Versus	...Petitioners
State of Punjab and others		...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr.Kapil Khanna, Advocate for petitioners
Mr.Kewal Singh, Addl.A.G., Punjab

Amarjot Bhatti, J.

1. Petitioners-Mili and Vinay 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 9.
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 19.4.2003. On the other hand, as per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 2, Annexure P-2, his date of birth is 22.9.1999. Petitioner no.1 has also filed affidavit regarding her date of birth in court today which is taken on record. They had performed marriage on 23.9.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv

**CRWP-9387-2024****:2:**

Mandir, MDC, Sector 6, Panchkula, Haryana is Annexure P-3 and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-4. Petitioners also moved representation to the Commissioner of Police, District Jalandhar, 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 9.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of this Court, Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents no.1 to 3-State. 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 petitioners, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 9. 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 23.9.2024 (Annexure P-5) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 9, considering



CRWP-9387-2024

:3:

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

30.09.2024
MFK

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