



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

169

CRWP-4643-2026.

Date of Decision: 21.04.2026.

Japleen Suneja and another

....Petitioners.

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Mohit Kakkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to official respondent Nos.2 and 3, to provide protection of lives and liberty of the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of private respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 – Japleen Suneja, aged 26 years and petitioner No.2 – Robin Chugh, aged 32 years, have solemnized marriage on 20.04.2026, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondent Nos.4 to 7. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that it is the first marriage of both the petitioners. It has been submitted that the private respondents are threatening to interfere in the matrimonial life of 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 20.04.2025

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

3. Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 3 only.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Amish Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 (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, Kaithal, to look into the representation dated 20.04.2026 (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.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

21.04.2026
jitender

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