



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

**CRWP No.4508 of 2025
Date of decision: 03.05.2025**

Priyanshi Singh and Another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

H.S. GREWAL J. (Oral)

The petitioners have come up before this Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking direction to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty as they apprehend danger from respondent Nos.4 and 5. It is stated in the petition that petitioners have performed their marriage, which is against the will of respondent Nos.4 and 5 and they have apprehension that the said respondents might cause physical harm to them.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners being major, got married against the wishes of respondent Nos.4 and 5. Ever since then, the petitioners are being threatened with dire consequences by the said respondents. Resultantly, a representation dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-5) was also made to Superintendent of Police, District Sirsa 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, District Sirsa to look into their representation dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-5) and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3 only.

4. At the asking of the Court, Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

5. Keeping in view the mandate of Supreme Court in the case of “**Lata Singh V. State of U.P. and another**”, 2006(5) SCC 475, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Superintendent of Police, District Sirsa, to look into the matter and take appropriate action in accordance with law to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent Nos.4 and 5.

6. It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as a stamp of this Court about the marriage of the parties and no opinion with regard to the validity of the marriage has been expressed in this order. Further, this is not a blanket order of protection from arrest in any FIR. It is further made clear that this order shall not come in the way if the interrogation of the petitioners is required in any cognizable case.

03.05.2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes / No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes / No</i>