

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

115

CRWP-12285-2024

Date of Decision:- 20.12.2024

Tajinder Singh and Anr.

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. L.S.Lakhanpal, Advocate for petitioners.

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

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioners Tajinder Singh and Jasvir Kaur have filed present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of necessary direction to respondents No. 1 to 3 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. As per Aadhar Card of petitioner No.1 (Annexure P-2), his date of birth is 26.09.1995. On the other hand as per Aadhar Card of petitioner No.2 (Annexure P-1), her date of birth is 10.01.2000. They had performed marriage on 12.12.2024. Copy of marriage certificate is Annexure P-3. Petitioners also moved representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, (Rural), Patiala dated 12.12.2024, which is Annexure P-4. Petitioners had performed marriage without consent and wishes of father and cousins of petitioner No.2. Respondents No.4 to 6 are father and cousins of petitioner No.2 from whom, petitioners are receiving threats.

As per petition, petitioner No.1 was earlier married with Reena and was having one daughter who is residing with him. They had filed

petition under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act. Decree of divorce dated 05.12.2023 is also placed on record.

- 3. Notice of motion.
- 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 father and cousins 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 & 3 are directed to consider representation of petitioners dated 12.12.2024 (Annexure P-4) 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.
- 9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

20.12.2024

Sunil Devi

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE