



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

133

CRWP-4886-2025
Decided on : 13.05.2025

Arati @ Arju and another . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv 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.

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

	Petitioner No. 1	Petitioner No. 2
Name(s)	Arati @ Arju	Kadir
Age (in years)	Aged 22 years	Aged 27 years
Date of marriage	08.05.2025	
Rite	Nikah	
Represented on	11.05.2025	
Submitted to	Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar	
Family members arrayed as	Respondents No.4 to 8	

2. From perusal of the case file, it transpires that both the petitioners are originally residents of Village Ismailpur, Sarsawa, Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.



Besides, in the instant petition, it has been projected that petitioner No.1 – Arati, who was previously Hindu by religion, has converted to Islam and thereafter performed ‘Nikah’ with petitioner No.2 – Kadir.

3. Further, to establish residence in the State of Haryana, counsel for the petitioners relies upon a rent agreement executed on 22.11.2024 (Annexure P-5), between petitioner No.2 – Kadir and one ‘*Sadik, son of Mohammad Khalid, resident of H.No.111, Vishal Colony, Tehsil Jagadhari, District Yamuna Nagar (landlord)*’. Counsel submits that since November 2024, petitioner No.2 has been residing at the aforementioned address in Haryana and has been driving a vehicle there.

However, on being asked by the Court, counsel for the petitioners could not disclose the registration number of the vehicle being driven by petitioner No.2. Moreover, there is no explanation in the petition regarding how petitioner No.1 – Arati arrived in the State of Haryana while petitioner No.2 was allegedly working there as a driver.

4. Serious doubts and contradictions arise regarding the petitioners’ conduct, particularly as to why they have chosen to file the present petition before this High Court when similar relief could have been sought by approaching the High Court in the State of Uttar Pradesh.

5. Accordingly, present petition stands **dismissed**.

6. Counsel for the petitioners is directed to hand over a copy of this petition to the learned State counsel during the course of the day.

7. Since this Court is raising concerns, respondent No.2, i.e., the Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, is directed to look into the matter



and verify whether petitioner No.2 is actually residing and working in the State of Haryana or whether a false plea has been taken before this Court.

However, it will be open for the petitioners to approach the High Court dealing with such disputes in the State of Uttar Pradesh.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 13, 2025

J.Ram

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