



108

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-10866-2024
Date of Decision:12.11.2024

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

CORAM:HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr.Raminder Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate for petitioners
Mr.Kewal Singh, Addl.A.G., Punjab

...

Amarjot Bhatti, J.

1. Petitioners-Sushma and Mohan have filed present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing respondent No.2 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No.3 to 6.
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 2.7.2002. As per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 2, Annexure P-2, his date of birth is 18.6.1998. They had performed marriage on 4.11.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Pandit Ram Chander Shastri, Shri Vaishno Mata Mandir, Kastoorba Nagar, Jalandhar Cantt. is Annexure P-3/T and

**CRWP-10866-2024****:2:**

photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-4. Petitioners also moved representation to Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar, Punjab which is Annexure P-6. 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. 3 to 6.

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 and 2- 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 petitioner no.1, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No. 3 to 6. It is duty of police to protect life and liberty of petitioners. Therefore, respondent No.2 is directed to consider representation of petitioners dated 4.11.2024. (Annexure P-6) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 3 to 6, considering threat perception, with further direction to maintain their privacy and dignity.



CRWP-10866-2024

:3:

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

12.11.2024
MFK
Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No