



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

121

CRWP-4300-2026**Date of decision: 18.04.2026****RACHNA AND ANOTHER****.... PETITIONER(S)****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS****....RESPONDENT(S)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that this is the second marriage between the petitioners. The petitioners have prayed for the issuance of necessary directions to the official respondents for protecting their civil/personal rights and liberties from being invaded by the private respondents.

The petitioners are alleged to have solemnized marriage on 15.04.2026 (Annexure P-5) on attaining the age of majority. Petitioner No.1 was previously married to Sunil Kumar, who passed away on 14.12.2018. Out of the said wedlock, one male child was born, and both the petitioners are ready and willing to take full responsibility for the upbringing and welfare of the said child. Petitioner No.2 was earlier married to Alka Mourya, however, no child was born out of the said wedlock, and due to temperamental differences, they obtained a decree of divorce by mutual consent on 27.10.2022. The petitioners feel reasonable apprehension and a threat perception at the hands of the private respondents and pray that their



personal/civil rights be not violated by them.

Precisely, in the context of the aforesaid relief, the petitioners have approached the Senior Superintendent of Police, District SAS Nagar (Mohali) Punjab-respondent no.2 by way of a representation dated 15.04.2026 (Annexure P-7).

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State of Punjab.

At this stage, without expressing any opinion as to the validity of the marriage and majority of the petitioners, it would be just and appropriate to direct respondent No.2 to look into the grievance of the petitioners and pass an appropriate order on merits in accordance with law. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any pleadings made in the petition. It would be appreciated if the needful is done within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

However, it is made clear that this order shall not debar the official respondents from proceeding against any of the parties, if they are involved in any other case.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

18.04.2026
Kusum

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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