

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**

**CWP No.12249 of 2024**  
**Date of Decision: 29.10.2024**

---

<b>Akansha Sharma &amp; Anr.</b>	<b>Versus</b>	<b>.....Petitioners</b>
<b>State of HP &amp; Ors.</b>		<b>.....Respondents</b>

---

**Coram****Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.****Whether approved for reporting?**

**For the Petitioner:** Mr. Naresh Kaul & Ms. Sheetal Kaul,  
Advocates.

**For the respondents:** Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, with Mr.  
Vishal Panwar & Mr. B.C. Verma, Additional  
Advocate Generals.

---

**Sandeep Sharma, J.** *(Oral)*

Petitioners herein, who have solemnized marriage against the wishes of parents of petitioner No. 1, have approached this Court in the instant proceedings, seeking therein direction to respondents No. 1 to 4 to provide them adequate protection and security on account of threats being received by them from respondents No. 5 to 8.

2. Precisely, the facts of the case as emerge, from the record are that petitioners, who are major, have solemnized marriage of their own volition and without any external pressure as is evident from the Marriage Certificate placed on record. Though parents of the petitioner No. 2 have no objection to the marriage of their son with the petitioner No. 1, but it appears that parents of petitioner No. 1 were opposed to

marriage of their daughter with petitioner No. 2 and as such, constant threats are being allegedly extended to both the petitioners by respondents No. 5 to 8. In the aforesaid background, petitioners herein though at first instance have approached Superintendent of Police, Kangra, for providing adequate security and protection, but since such prayer of them was not exceeded to by the afore authority, they have approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

2. Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General, while putting in appearance on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4, states that request, if any, made by the petitioners shall be considered strictly in accordance with law. He states that otherwise also respondents No. 1 to 4 are under obligation to protect the life and property of the petitioners, who admittedly at this juncture reside at Village Uppar Sawana, Tehsil Jaswan, under Police Station Dehra, District Kangra, HP. Though no cogent and convincing evidence has been adduced on record by the petitioners suggestive of the fact that they are being threatened by respondents No. 5 to 8, but this Court having taken note of fact that petitioner No. 1 has solemnized marriage with the petitioner No. 2 against the wishes of her parents, sees no impediment in accepting the prayer made on behalf of petitioners to the extent that as and when application is filed by them before Superintendent of Police, Kangra, for providing adequate security, same shall be considered and decided by the authority

concerned taking note of potential threat, if any, to the life and property of the petitioners. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, being aggrieved, if any, on account of registration of case at the behest of parents of petitioner No. 1 in the State of Haryana and Delhi, petitioners may have to approach competent Court of law in State of Haryana/Delhi, but certainly they are required to be provided adequate security and protection in the State of Himachal Pradesh that too after being satisfied that on account of marriage, there is potential threat to their life and property.

Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms, alongwith all pending applications.

**October 29, 2024**

*(Sunil)*

**(Sandeep Sharma),  
Judge**