



130

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

CRWP-11036-2024

Date of Decision:- 14.11.2024

Diksha and Another

....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

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

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. AG Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioners Diksha and Amit Kumar have filed present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, directing respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 7, who are family members/relatives of petitioner No.1.

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. As per copy of Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 1, her date of birth is 19.12.2004. On the other hand, as per copy of Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 2, Annexure P-2, his date of birth is 13.07.1997. They had performed marriage on 08.11.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Shree Bharamari Devi Jan Kalyan Sansthan (Regd.), Mansa Devi Market, Sector 4, Panchkula is Annexure P-4 and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-3. Petitioners also moved representation to Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar and SHO, Police Station Jagadhri

City, Yamuna Nagar, 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 7.

3. Notice of motion to official respondents only.
4. On asking of this Court, Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. AG Haryana 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/relatives of petitioner No. 1, as a result they are apprehending threats from hands of respondents No. 4 to 7. 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 12.11.2024 (Annexure P-5) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7, 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

14.11.2024

Monika

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