



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

**CRWP No.2126 of 2025
Date of decision: 04.03.2025**

Tamanna and Another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Mr. Prashant Sethi, Advocate (Through VC)
for the petitioners.

H.S. GREWAL J.

The petitioners are seeking a direction to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty as they apprehend danger from private respondents. It is stated in the petition that petitioners have performed their marriage, which is against the will of private respondents and they have apprehension that the private respondents might cause physical harm to them.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners being major, got married against the wishes of private respondents. Ever since then, the petitioners are being threatened with dire consequences by the private respondents. Resultantly, a representation dated 26.02.2025 (Annexure P-7) was also made to Senior Superintendent of Police, District Jind, wherein a mention has been made about the alleged threat perception. Learned counsel submits that despite the official respondents having been communicated about the alleged threat perception, no steps have been taken to come to the rescue of the petitioners. Learned counsel submits that he would be satisfied if directions are issued to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Jind, to look into their representation



dated 26.02.2025 (Annexure P-7) and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 4 only.
4. At the asking of the Court, Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4.
5. Keeping in view the mandate of Supreme Court in the case of “**Lata Singh V. State of U.P. and another**”, 2006(5) SCC 475, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 -Superintendent of Police, District Jind, to look into the matter and take appropriate action in accordance with law to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.
6. It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as a stamp of this Court about the marriage of the parties and no opinion with regard to the validity of the marriage has been expressed in this order.

04.03.2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes / No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes / No</i>