



135

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

**CRWP-7074-2025
DECIDED ON: 03.07.2025**

ANJALI AND ANOTHER**.....PETITIONERS**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Rahul Rana, Advocate for
Mr. Sumit Bairagi, Advocate for the petitioners

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No.1 to 3 to provide security to the petitioners and to save life, liberty and property of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Petitioner No.1 was born on 30.10.2006 and Petitioner No.2 on 26.01.1998. Both petitioners, being Indian citizens, voluntarily entered into a matrimonial alliance with each other. However, the private respondents are opposing their marriage. Notwithstanding such opposition, the petitioners solemnized their marriage in accordance with Hindu rites and ceremonies on 02.06.2025 at Prachin Pashupati Nath Mandir, Karnal as averred in paragraph 6 of the petition. A copy of the marriage certificate has been placed on record as Annexure P-3.

A perusal of the marriage certificate (Annexure P-3) reveals that the assertions made in the petition are factually incorrect and inconsistent with the

documentary evidence. The marriage certificate is dated 02.07.2025, and not 02.06.2025 as stated in the petition, indicating a discrepancy in the date of marriage either in the petition or in the certificate. Furthermore, the issuing authority mentioned in the certificate differs from the details pleaded in the petition, particularly in paragraph 6, where it is averred that the marriage was solemnized at “Prachin Pashupati Nath Mandir, Karnal.” However, the marriage certificate has been issued by “Maa Baglamukhi Jyotish Anushtan Kendra,” Shri Hanuman Mandir, Nirmal Vihar, Karnal.

Aanother factor in the mind of this Court that in the representation to the police authorities also the date of marriage is 02.06.2025, which makes the pleadings to be doubtful and cannot be accepted by this Court in the present form. On this account, this petition is totally seems to be frivolous and unfounded with false averments made therein.

Another ground for not admitting the instant petition is that the petitioner has submitted a representation dated 02.06.2025 (Annexure P-5), whereas the courier receipt appended to the petition is dated 02.07.2025, and the petition itself was filed on 03.07.2025. It is therefore plausible that the representation may not have reached the office of the Superintendent of Police, Karnal, within the said timeframe. Additionally, the courier receipt does not specify the time of dispatch nor the place from which it was sent, which are ordinarily mandatory details that a courier service provider must record on the receipt.

In the light of above-said factual aspects, this kind of practice needs to be curbed, which is on surge in the High Court.

On a previous occasion, in the petition bearing CRWP-12562-2023 titled as *Kajal vs. Babli*, this Court framed guidelines based on which the State of

Haryana issued a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) vide Notification No. 12/252/2023-4HG-IV dated 17.02.2025, issued by the Home Department, Government of Haryana. Upon inquiry by this Court, the petitioner acknowledged awareness of the said SOP and averred that their representation was to be decided within three days by the Nodal Officer or any other designated authority, as per the SOP. However, despite the fact that the stipulated period of three days had not yet expired, the present petition has been filed prematurely. Furthermore, the petition contains several averments that lack credibility, beginning with the synopsis which states the date of marriage as 02.06.2025, whereas paragraph 6 refers to a temple different from the one indicated in the marriage certificate, which itself records a different date of marriage. Additionally, the representation (Annexure P-5), dated 02.06.2025, was dispatched only on 02.07.2025, as shown by the courier receipt an important and material fact.

Having no merits, the petition is hereby dismissed.

Since the petition has been drafted in a very casual manner by the counsel probably having incorrect facts as well doubtful documents attached to the petition, the same is hereby dismissed with exemplary cost of Rs.50,000/- to be deposited with the Punjab & Haryana High Court Bar Clerk's Association, Chandigarh within a period of one week from today.

Registry is directed to list the matter after the above-said direction is complied with by the petitioners.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

03.07.2025
Meenu

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