



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

115

**CRWP-6168-2026
Date of decision: 26.05.2026**

SAMIKSHA AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Akashdeep Miglani, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana
(Through Video Conferencing).

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed for seeking issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent No.4.

2. It has been contended that the petitioners are major and they solemnized marriage on 24.03.2026 against the wishes of their parents. After the marriage, they apprised the factum of the marriage to the respective parties, however, the same enraged the parents of petitioner No.1 and they started pressurizing the petitioner No.2 to break the marriage. The petitioners accordingly moved a representation dated 24.03.2026 to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty.

3. It is further submitted that the petitioners had filed CRWP-3504 of 2026 which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 25.03.2026 with a direction to the respondents-authorities to look into the representation dated 24.03.2026 and take appropriate decision thereupon.

4. Learned State Counsel was directed to seek instructions in the matter vide order dated 22.05.2026. On resumed hearing, she contends, on instructions from the concerned Station House Officer that neither any representation has been received nor the petitioners have approached for grant of protection.

5. Learned State Counsel has been confronted with the first part of the instruction about no representation being submitted from the order dated 02.04.2026 passed by the Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar (Annexure P-7) who himself acknowledged the receipt of representation dated 24.03.2026. As a matter of fact, the Station House Officer had been directed to provide contact numbers of the District control room, Incharge of security of the Police as well as himself to be contacted in the case of emergency and to take preventive measures to avoid any untoward incident.

6. Prima facie, this Court finds that the instructions given by the SHO to the State Counsel are evasive and in breach of the order already passed by the Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar.

7. The present petition is accordingly disposed of with a direction to the concerned Station House Officer to take steps to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners are protected. A compliance report be filed before this Court within a period of two weeks, failing which the Station House Officer, Police Station Kishanpura, District Yamuna Nagar shall remain present in Court to explain the reasons for failure to comply with the

order passed by the Superintendent of Police on 02.04.2026 and not taking steps to ensure protection of life and liberties of the petitioners herein.

The present petition is accordingly disposed of.

MAY 26, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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