



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

**CRWP No.2391 of 2025
Date of decision: 11.03.2025**

Neha and AnotherPetitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and OthersRespondents

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

Present: Mr. Shivam Vashisht, Advocate
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 04.03.2025 (Annexure P-4) was also made to Senior Superintendent of Police, District Patiala, 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- Senior Superintendent of Police, District Patiala, to look into



their representation dated 04.03.2025 (Annexure P-4) and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3 only.
4. At the asking of the Court, Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3.
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 - Senior Superintendent of Police, District Patiala, 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.

11.03.2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes / No
Whether reportable : Yes / No