



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

104

CRWP-12215-2024

Date of decision: 09.01.2025

SHAHNAJ ALIAS SANJANA KUMARI AND ANOTHER
....PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. D.D. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent Nos.6, 9 and 10 and has filed his *vakalatnama* in Court today. The same be taken on record.

1. By way of present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioners are seeking issuance of directions to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty at the hands of respondent Nos.6 to 15.
2. Notice of motion to respondents Nos. 1 to 5 (i.e. official respondents).
3. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Yuvraj Singh Tiwana, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.
4. As per the petitioners, they have married on 13.12.2024 against the wishes of respondent Nos. 6 to 15, who happen to be the family members/relative of the petitioners.



5. Both the petitioners have claimed themselves to be major relying upon their Aadhar Cards indicating that date of birth of petitioner No.1-Shahnaj @ Sanjana Kumari is 01.01.2003 and petitioner No.2-Jitendra is 01.01.2001.

6. Without commenting on the legality and validity of the marriage as also the merits of contentions raised in the petition, I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No.2 (Senior Superintendent of Police) to look into the representation dated 13.12.2024 (Annexure P-7) stated to have been submitted by the petitioners & pass appropriate orders thereupon within two weeks from today.

7. Keeping in view the fact that both the petitioners claim to have married against the wishes of their family(s), I direct that if possible, respondent No.2 (SSP) may call a meeting of the petitioners as well as the parents of both the petitioners and their other concerned family members in his/her presence so that the parties may endeavour to resolve their dispute(s) and live amicably.

8. However, if the petitioners are found to have been involved in any other case, then this order shall not preclude the competent authority from taking lawful action against the petitioners.

9. The petition stands disposed off. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

January 09, 2025

jatin

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No