



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

CRWP-11360-2024

Date of Decision:- 25.11.2024

Harjit Singh and another

....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI


Present:- Mr. Hardeep Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioners Harjit Singh and Anuksha have filed present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing respondents No. 1 to 4 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No 5 to 10, who are parents/relatives of petitioner No. 2. There is further prayer for issuing direction to official respondents to decide representation dated 21.11.2024 (Annexure P-5) of petitioners.

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. As per copy of Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 1, Annexure P-1, his year of birth is 1996. On the other hand, as per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No.2, Annexure P-2, her date of birth is 15.09.2003. They had performed marriage on 21.11.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir Society, Booth No. 228, MDC, Sector 4, Panchkula (Haryana) is Annexure P-3 and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-4. Petitioners also moved representations to



Senior Superintendent of Police (Rural), District Jalandhar, which is Annexure P-5. Petitioners had performed marriage without consent and wishes of family members/relatives of petitioner No. 2 and as such they are receiving threats from respondents No. 5 to 10.

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/relatives of petitioner No. 2, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No. 5 to 10. It is duty of police to protect life and liberty of petitioners. Therefore, respondents No. 2 to 4 are directed to consider representation of petitioners dated 21.11.2024 (Annexure P-5) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 5 to 10, 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

25.11.2024
lalit