

119

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3390-2025

Decided on: 08.04.2025

Ramandeep Kaur and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in the instant petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of direction to the official respondents to provide protection of lives and liberty to the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of the private respondents.

The details, relevant for decision of the present petition, are tabulated as under:-

	Petitioner No. 1	Petitioner No. 2
Name(s)	Ramandeep Kaur	Keshav Kumar
Age (in years)	28 years	31 years
Date of marriage	02.04.2025	
Rite	Hindu rites	
Representation dated	02.04.2025	
Submitted to	Respondents No.2-The Superintendent of Police, Hisar, Haryana	
Family members arrayed as	Respondents No. 4 to 7	

2. In compliance to the order dated 04.04.2025 passed by this Court, photographs of marriage have been filed in the Registry. Same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book.



CRWP-3390-2025

2

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have solemnized marriage against the wishes of their family members, who are threatening and interfering in the matrimonial life of the petitioners. It is the first marriage of both 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 02.04.2025 (Annexure P-4), to The Senior Superintendent of Police, Hisar, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

4. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

5. On asking of the Court, learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent – State. Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be supplied to learned State counsel during course of the day.

6. During the course of hearing, it is noticed that in the memo of parties, The Superintendent of Police, Sirsa is impleaded as respondent No.2, whereas representation dated 02.04.2025 has been addressed to The Superintendent of Police Hisar by the petitioners.

7. In view of above, petitioners would again submit their fresh representation to the concerned Superintendent of Police and thereupon the issue of granting of protection of life and liberty to the petitioners would be considered *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.

8. 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.

9. Disposed of in the above terms.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 08, 2025
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO