



CRWP-4746-2026

165

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-4746-2026
Date of decision: 23.04.2026

Dilbag Singh and another
.....Petitioners
Versus

State of Punjab and others
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Pankaj Garg, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

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

The details, relevant for decision of the present petition, are tabulated as under:-

	Petitioner No. 1	Petitioner No. 2
Name(s)	Dilbag Singh	Jaspreet Kaur
Age (in years)	31 years	18 years
Date of marriage	22.04.2026	
Rite	Sikh	
Represented on	22.04.2026 (Annexure P-5)	
Submitted to	Senior Superintendent of Police, Barnala	
Family members arrayed as	Respondent Nos.4 to 10	

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have solemnized marriage against the wishes of their family members, who are



CRWP-4746-2026

threatening and interfering in the matrimonial life of the petitioners. It is the first marriage of both 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 22.04.2026 (Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Barnala, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.
4. On asking of the Court, learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent – 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 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Barnala to look into the representation dated 22.04.2026 (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. Looking at the age difference of both the petitioners, respondent No. 2 is also directed to verify, if petitioner No. 1, who is aged 31 years is earlier married or not.
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.

23.04.2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned: | Yes /No |
| 2. Whether reportable : | Yes /No |