



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

CRWP-5957-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.06.2025

AKASHDEEP KAUR AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Mohit Kakkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for seeking issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from respondents No.4 to 6.

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioners is that both the petitioners are major, aged above 21 years and above 29 years respectively. In support thereof, copies of Aadhaar Cards pertaining to the petitioners have been appended. The learned counsel for petitioners further contends that they have performed marriage against the wishes of their parents and the marriage of the petitioners was solemnized on 30.05.2025. Copy of Marriage Certificate (Annexure P-3) and copy of photographs of marriage (Annexure P-4) have also been appended. He further contends that the petitioners apprehend threat to their life and liberty and claim that there is a constant danger of being implicated in a false case, and even a representation dated 01.06.2025 (Annexure P-5) has also been sent by the petitioners to respondents No.2 and 3 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar and SHO Police Station Chhajli, Sangrur but the same has not been decided till date and the petitioners would be satisfied if the said representation is decided in a time bound manner.



3. Notice of motion restricted to respondents No.1 to 3 only.
4. Pursuant to supply of advance copy, Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and has no objection if appropriate directions are given for deciding the representation submitted by the petitioners. He submits that as per Annexure P-5, the representation has been sent to Senior Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar and not to Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur.
5. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that inadvertently in the representation, it has been mentioned as Senior Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar instead of Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur. However, e-mail sent to Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur. He prays that the present petition be treated as representation and respondent No.2 may be directed to decide the same.
6. Therefore, without examining the question of legality and validity of the marriage and expressing any opinion thereon, the petition is disposed of with the directions to respondents No.2 and 3 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur and SHO Police Station Chajli, Sangrur to treat this petition as representation and look into the grievances of the petitioners as set out in the petition and take appropriate action for protection of their life and liberty as may be warranted by the circumstances in accordance with law.
7. The Registry is directed to send a copy of this order along with copy of the petition to respondents No.2 and 3 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur and SHO Police Station Chhajli, Sangrur for requisite compliance.

04.06.2025
sandeep

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No