



CRWP-139-2025

-1-

111

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

CRWP-139-2025

Date of Decision: January 09, 2025

Harpuneet Kaur Gill and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms.Manpreet Kaur Gill, Advocate
for the petitioners.
Mr.Harwinderjeet Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

.....

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondents No.4 to 8 and not to interfere in the matrimonial life of the petitioners at the behest of respondents No.4 to 8 and other relatives and friends.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that both the petitioners are major and have married against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 8 and have sought protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 8. Their marriage certificate and photographs evidencing their marriage are on record as Annexures P-3 and P-4. The petitioners have submitted a representation dated 07.01.2025 (Annexure P-7) to respondent No.2.



4. On asking of the Court, Mr.Tarun Aggarwal, Sr.DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State whereas Mr.Harwinder Singh Sandhu, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.4 and filed his power of attorney. He has stated that they are ready to settle the matter amicably.

5. Heard.

6. Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Moga, to decide the representation (Annexure P-7) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived. It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order would not be understood having expressed any opinion whatsoever by this Court on the validity of the marriage of the petitioners. The parties are free to make efforts for settlement of their dispute accordingly.

January 09, 2025

meenuss

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned ?

Yes/No

2. Whether reportable ?

Yes/No