



145

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

CRWP-11524-2024

Date of Decision:- 28.11.2024

Garima Shourie and another

....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

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

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioners Garima Shourie and Chiraag Sharma have filed petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in nature of Mandamus, directing respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No. 4 and 5, who are parents of petitioner No. 1.

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 18.09.2002. On the other hand, as per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No.2 (Annexure P-2) his date of birth is 29.12.1995. They had performed marriage on 24.11.2024. Copy of Certificate of Marriage issued by Sri Hanuman Mandir Satsang Mandal Trust, Rajpura Road, Patiala is Annexure P-3 and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-4. Petitioners also moved representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, which is Annexure P-5. Petitioners had performed marriage without consent and wishes of parents of petitioner No. 1 and as such they are receiving threats from respondents No. 4 and 5.

3. Notice of motion to official respondents only.
4. On asking of this Court, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, 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 parents of petitioner No. 1, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No. 4 and 5. 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 24.11.2024 (Annexure P-5) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No 4 and 5, 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

28.11.2024

lalit

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No