



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

120

CRWP-4878-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.04.2026

SHWETA AND ANOTHER

... Petitioners

Versus

UT OF CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sandeep Kumar Rawal, Advocate for
Mr. Arun Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents, as they have attained majority and married against the wishes of their family members.

2. Learned counsel states that the petitioners will be satisfied if the Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh i.e. respondent No.2 is directed to look into the representation dated 25.04.2026 (Annexure P-5), made to him by them and take appropriate action on the same.

3. As per the averments made, both the petitioners are major and their dates of birth are 17.08.2002 and 23.11.2001, respectively. The copies of their *Aadhar* cards are appended as Annexures P-1 and P-2, respectively. They got married on 25.04.2026 and the Marriage Certificate is enclosed with the petition as Annexure P-3.

4. Notice of motion.

5. At the asking of the Court, Mr. Ganesh K. Sharma, Addl. PP, UT Chandigarh, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and has no objection in deciding the representation filed on behalf of the petitioners.

6. In view of the limited prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioners and without going into the merits of their claim, this petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2 to look into the representation dated 25.04.2026 (Annexure P-5) and decide the same expeditiously, in accordance with law.

7. It is however, made clear that this order shall not preclude the authorities to proceed against the petitioners, in case, they are found involved in any other criminal proceedings, instituted/pending against them if there is some evidence that surfaces regarding their involvement in a cognizable offence, for which they may be required by the investigating agency.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

28.04.2026

ashok

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No