IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20053 of 2026
Date of Decision: 5.11.2026

Vivek Kumar and Anr.

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

.....Respondents

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Pawan Gautam, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Petitioners herein, who have solemnized marriage of their own will and volition, have approached this Court in the instant proceedings seeking direction to the police authorities to provide them protection on account of threats being extended to do away with their lives by respondents No. 4 to 8, who are parents of petitioner No. 2.

2. Having regard to the nature of prayer and order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no necessity to issue notices to respondents No. 4 to 8, whereas respondents No. 1 to 3 are being represented by Sh. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General.

3. Facts of the case, as emerge from the pleadings adduced on record by respective parties are that petitioners, who are major, have solemnized marriage against the wishes of parents of petitioner No. 2, Sneha Sharma, who are opposed to marriage on account of difference in caste. Though material adduced on record clearly reveals that petitioners have solemnized marriage, but they are unable to live freely on account of constant threats being extended by respondents No. 4 to 8.

4. Though at the first instance, petitioner requested the police to provide security, but since no heed was paid to their request, they approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

5. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General representing respondents No. 1 to 3, fairly states that it is the duty of respondent-State to provide adequate protection to the life and property of its residents, including the petitioners. He states that though he has reason to presume and believe that some action must have been taken upon the complaint, if any, made by petitioners, but if not, same shall be taken expeditiously.

6. Vide representation dated 19.10.2026, petitioners requested SSP, Nurpur, District Kangra for providing protection to safeguard their life and liberty, but it appears that same is still pending consideration and as such, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to

dispose of the same with the direction to aforesaid authority to ensure that representation preferred by petitioners is considered and decided expeditiously, within 24 hours. Ordered accordingly.

7. While doing the needful in terms of instant order, SSP, after having examined threat perception, if any, to petitioners, besides providing adequate security, shall also make an effort to call the parents of petitioner No. 2 and counsel them, so that no untoward incident happens and petitioners are able to live freely.

8. Learned Additional Advocate General is directed to apprise the factum of passing of instant order to the authorities through telephone today itself, so that appropriate action in terms of instant order is taken within stipulated time.

Dasti copy.

November 05, 2026 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(manjit) **Judge**