

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:051590



(140) CRWP-3945-2025
Date of Decision: 22.04.2025

Harjinder Kaur & another --Petitioners
Versus
State of Haryana & others --Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Kanwar Sanjeev Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH.J (Oral)

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

	Petitioner No.1	Petitioner No.2
Names	Harjinder Kaur	Pinku
Age (in years)	26 years	24 years
Date of marriage	18.04.2025	
Rite	Hindu Rites	
Represented on	20.04.2025	
Submitted to	S.P., Ambala	
Family members arrayed as	Respondents no.4 and 5	

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 20.04.2025 (Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

4. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana 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. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2, to look into the representation dated 20.04.2025 (Annexure P-5), 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.

7. 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.

22.04.2025
lucky

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No