



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

**115**

**CRWP-654-2025(O&M)  
Decided on :22.01.2025**

Manpreet Kaur and another

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

PRESENT: Mr. Rajesh Kumar Kashyap, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to official respondents No.2 & 3, to provide protection of lives and liberty of the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of respondents No. 4 to 7.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1– Manpreet Kaur, aged 21 years and petitioner No.2–Amandeep Singh aged 31 years, have solemnized marriage on 20.01.2025, against the wishes of their family members, arrayed as respondents No.4 to 7. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that it is the first marriage of both the petitioners. It has been submitted that the private respondents are threatening to interfere in the matrimonial life of 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 20.01.2025 (Annexure P-5), to respondent No.2–The Senior Superintendent



**CRWP-654-2025(O&M)**

- 2 -

of Police, Patiala, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

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

4. On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 (State).

Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be supplied to learned State counsel during course of the day.

5. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2– The Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to look into the representation dated 20.01.2025 (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 fact that there is 10 years of age gap between both the petitioners, the official respondents would also ensure petitioner No.3 is already 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.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE**

**January 22, 2025**

*Rashmi*

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