



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

119

**CRWP-5615-2026
Decided on : 21.05.2026**

Ankita and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**PRESENT:** Ms. Janya Sirohi, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the instant petition, filed under Articles 226/227 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.

2. On 13.05.2026, following was recorded :-

“2. Primarily, it is noticed that petitioner No.1 – Ankita, is resident of H.No.29, Ward No.07, 11GB-A, Ganganagar Rajasthan – 335704, and private respondents No.4 to 7, are also residents of State of Rajasthan. Whereas, petitioner No.2 – Manish Kumar, is resident of Village Daulatpura, Tehsil Abohar, District Fazilka, Punjab.

3. Learned State counsel is directed to verify the credentials of both the petitioners, including their original place of residence(s) and other antecedents, as well as the circumstances under which they came into contact with each other.

State shall also verify whether any criminal case(s) stand registered against either of them.

4. List again on 21.05.2026.



Counsel for the petitioners is directed to handover the complete set of paper book to learned State counsel in Court today.”

3. In compliance thereto, today learned State counsel submits that petitioner No.1 – Ankita, though is resident of State of Rajasthan, however, no criminal case was found registered at the instance of her family members, against petitioner No.2.

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

	Petitioner No. 1	Petitioner No. 2
Name(s)	Ankita	Manish Kumar
Age (in years)	About 25 years	About 34 years
Date of marriage	03.05.2026	
Rite	Hindu rites	
Represented on	08.05.2026	
Submitted to	Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka	
Family members arrayed as	Respondents No.4 to 10	

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have solemnized marriage against the wishes of their family members, who are 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 08.05.2026 (Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

6. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

7. 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.

8. In view of the above, the present petition is **disposed of** with a direction to respondent No.2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, to look into the representation dated 08.05.2026 (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.

9. 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.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 21, 2026

J.Ram

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