



111 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3800-2025

Date of decision: 17.04.2025

MOHIT ATHWAL AND ANR

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE **AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. A.S. Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J (Oral):

1. Petitioners Mohit Athwal and Sheetal Rani have filed present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing respondents No.1 to 3 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 8, with further prayer to decide representation dated 11.04.2025 (Annexure P-5).

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. As per copy of Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 1 (Annexure P-1), his date of birth is 10.10.1997. On the other hand, as per copy of Aadhaar Card of petitioner No.2 (Annexure P-2), her date of birth is 12.01.1997. They had performed marriage on 10.04.2025. Copy of Certificate of Marriage is Annexure P-3 and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-4. Petitioners also moved representation to the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Patiala, Punjab, which is Annexure P-5. Petitioners had performed marriage without consent and wishes of family



members/relatives of petitioner No.2 and as such they are receiving threats from respondents No. 4 to 8.

- 3. Notice of motion to official respondents only.
- 4. On advance notice, Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, DAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of State. Complete copy of paperbook along with supporting documents is already supplied.
- 5. Considering nature of litigation, no purpose would be served by serving notice to private respondents.
- 6. I have considered the facts narrated in petition, according to which both petitioners are major and they have performed marriage against wishes of family members/relatives of petitioner No.2, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hand of respondents No. 4 to 8. It is duty of police to protect life and liberty of petitioners. Therefore, respondents No.1 to 3 are directed to consider representation of petitioners dated 11.04.2025 (Annexure P-5) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 8, considering threat perception, with further direction to maintain their privacy and dignity.
- 7. Aforesaid protection order will have no bearing on legality and validity of marriage and it will not protect them in case there is any violation of law or pending legal proceedings.
- 8. Petition is accordingly disposed of.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

17.04.2025
monika

- 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
- 2. Whether reportable : Yes /No