

**CRWP-8169-2024****-1-****109****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRWP-8169-2024****Date of Decision: August 28, 2024**

Baljeet Rani and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJPresent: Mr.Kanihya Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

.....

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners by providing adequate security/police protection to them and also directing respondents No.4 to 6 not to interfere in the personal life and liberty of the petitioners and further direct respondents No.2 and 3 not to allow respondents No.4 to 6 or anybody else to interfere with the liberty and life of the petitioners or to harass them in any manner or to cause any detriment to the petitioners in any manner.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that both the petitioners are major and have married against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 6 and have sought protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 6. Their marriage certificate evidencing their marriage is on record as Annexure P-3. The petitioners have



CRWP-8169-2024

-2-

submitted a representation, dated 21.08.2024 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3-State only.

On asking of the Court, Mr.Tarun Aggarwal, Sr.DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State.

Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, District Patiala, to decide the representation (Annexure P-4) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived. It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order would not be understood having expressed any opinion whatsoever by this Court on the validity of the marriage of the petitioners.

August 28, 2024
meenuss

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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