



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

132

CRWP-205-2025

Decided on : 10.01.2025

Manpreet Kaur and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Shivam Kamboj Sirsa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to official respondents No.2 & 3, 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 – Manpreet Kaur, aged 18 years and 3 months and petitioner No.2 – Gagandeep Singh, aged about 27 years, have solemnized marriage on 06.11.2024, as per Hindu rites, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 6. 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 a representation dated 07.01.2025



(Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Sirsa, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

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

4. On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, 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 – Superintendent of Police, Sirsa, to look into the representation dated 07.01.2025 (Annexure P-5), *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 10, 2025

J.Ram

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