

2025:PHHC:042745



109.

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

CRWP-3113-2025

Date of decision: 28.03.2025

Neha Devi and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 & 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners, who apprehend threat to their life at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 9, who are stated to be family members of petitioner No.1.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1, aged about 23 years, and petitioner No.2, aged about 24 years, got married on 20.03.2025 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 25.03.2025 (Annexure P-5) was also made to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Panipat, 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, Panipat to look into the representation dated 25.03.2025 (Annexure P-5) and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Rahul Mohan, Senior DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with directions to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Panipat to look into the representation dated 25.03.2025 (Annexure P-5) *qua* the alleged threat perception and take necessary steps, as may be required, in accordance with law, to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents. 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.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

March 28, 2025

sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No