



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

110

CRWP-112-2025

Decided on : 13.01.2025

Anita Rani and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ranjodh Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to official respondents No.3 & 4, to provide protection of lives and liberty of the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Anita Rani, aged about 18 years and petitioner No.2 – Gagandeep Singh @ Gagan, aged about 21 years, have solemnized marriage on 14.09.2024, as per Hindu rites, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.5 to 9. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that it is the first marriage of both the petitioners. It has been submitted that the private respondents are threatening to interfere in the matrimonial life of the petitioners. Hence, the petitioners are seeking protection in that regard and have approached this Court by way of filing the instant petition. They have also submitted representation dated 11.12.2024 (Annexure P-8), to



respondent No.2 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only.

4. On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, appears on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 (State).

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran, to look into the representation dated 11.12.2024 (Annexure P-8), *qua* threat perception, and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents.

6. However, this direction will not validate the marriage said to have taken place between the parties and will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 13, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No