



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
148

CRWP-6577-2025
Decided on : 23.06.2025

Shubham and another . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana and others . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Rajender Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, 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)	Shubham	Kajal Saini
Age (in years)	About 25 years	About 23 years
Date of marriage	17.06.2025	
Rite	Hindu Rites	
Represented on	18.06.2025	
Submitted to	Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar	
Family members arrayed as	Respondents No.4 to 6	

2. 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 18.06.2025



(Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, 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.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, to look into the representation dated 18.06.2025 (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.

6. 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.

7. Besides above, it is relevant to note that petitioner No.2 – Kajal Saini and her family members (respondents No.4 & 5) are residents of District Saharanpur (U.P.). Therefore, present protection order/direction would not be applicable, if there is any, criminal case registered against petitioner(s), even in the State of Uttar Pradesh, in regard to the relations between the petitioners.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

June 23, 2025

J.Ram

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