



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

129

CRWP-792-2025

Decided on : 24.01.2025

Dogri and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

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

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

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 – Dogri, aged about 18 years and petitioner No.2 – Deepak Sharma, aged 30 years, have solemnized marriage on 21.01.2025, as per Hindu rites, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 & 5. 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 21.01.2025 (Annexure P-4), to respondent No.2 – Sr. Superintendent of Police, Pathankot, Punjab, 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, Pathankot, Punjab, to look into the representation dated 21.01.2025 (Annexure P-4), *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.
7. Besides, it is also clarified that in case a criminal case is already registered against any of the petitioners, the authorities concerned would not be even required to examine the representation, except in some exceptional circumstances, where there is an actual danger to the lives and liberty of the petitioner.

Since, there is a gap of about 12 years in the age of both the petitioners, the authorities concerned would examine whether petitioner No.2 is already married or not ?

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 24, 2025

J.Ram

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