



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

110

CRWP-4285-2025

Date of decision: 29.04.2025

PRIYANKA RANI AND ANOTHER**....PETITIONERS**

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Prince Srangal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. By way of present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioners are seeking issuance of directions to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty at the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 7.
2. Notice of motion to respondents Nos. 1 to 3 (i.e. official respondents).
3. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Inderjeet Singh Ladher, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.
4. As per the petitioners, they have married on 25.04.2025 against the wishes of respondent Nos. 4 to 7, who happen to be the family members/relative of the petitioners.
5. Both the petitioners have claimed themselves to be major relying upon their Aadhar Cards indicating that date of birth of petitioner No.1-Priyanka Rani is about 18 years old and petitioner No.2-Sunil Kumar is 18.01.1999.



6. Without commenting on the legality and validity of the marriage as also the merits of contentions raised in the petition, I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No.2 (Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka District Fazilka) to look into the representation dated 26.04.2025 (Annexure P-4) stated to have been submitted by the petitioners & pass appropriate orders thereupon within two weeks from today.

7. Keeping in view the fact that both the petitioners claim to have married against the wishes of their family(s), I direct that if possible, respondent No.2 (SSP) may call a meeting of the petitioners as well as the parents of both the petitioners and their other concerned family members in his/her presence so that the parties may endeavour to resolve their dispute(s) and live amicably.

8. Liberty is reserved in favour of private respondents to seek recall of this order on showing sufficient cause.

9. However, if the petitioners are found to have been involved in any other case, then this order shall not preclude the competent authority from taking lawful action against the petitioners.

10. The petition stands disposed off. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

April 29, 2025
jatn

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No