



134

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

CRWP-10767-2024

Date of Decision:- 07.11.2024

Sahil and another

....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Jagpal Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioners Sahil and Suman have filed present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 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 6, who are family members of petitioner No. 2. There is a further prayer for taking into consideration representation dated 05.11.2024 (Annexure P-1).

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major and are 28 years old. Learned counsel for petitioners has placed on record copy of Matriculation Examination Certificate of petitioner No. 2, as per which her date of birth is 10.07.1996. They had performed marriage on 05.11.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir, MDC, Sector-6, Panchkula, Haryana is Annexure P-2 and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-3.

Petitioners also moved representation to Senior Superintendent of Police

(Rural), Jalandhar, which is Annexure P-1. Petitioners had performed marriage without consent and wishes of family members of petitioner No. 2 and as such they are receiving threats from respondents No. 4 to 6.

3. Notice of motion to official respondents only.
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 members of petitioner No. 2, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 6. 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 05.11.2024 (Annexure P-1) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 6, 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

07.11.2024
lalit

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