



114 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-12632-2024

Date of decision: 31.12.2024

Deepika Khurana and another

.....Petitioners

 V/s

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Vishal Singh Borwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the private respondent No.4.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that both the petitioners are major, aged about 25 years and 24 years respectively. In support thereof, copies of Aadhaar Cards pertaining to the petitioners have been appended (Annexures P-1 & P-2). The learned counsel for petitioners further contends that petitioners have performed marriage against the wishes of their parents and the marriage was solemnized on 07.12.2024. Copy of Marriage Certificate (Annexure P-3) has also been appended. He also contends that the representation dated 16.12.2024 (Annexures P-4) sent by the petitioners to respondent No. 2-Superintendent of Police, District Rohtak has not been decided till date and the petitioners would be satisfied if the representation be decided in a time bound manner.



3. After going through the contents of the representation dated 16.12.2024 (Annexure P-4), the same seems to be vague and half-baked, wherein no specific details have been mentioned.
4. Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present petition be treated as representation and the same be ordered to be decided within a time bound manner by looking into the grievance of the petitioners.
5. Notice of motion restricted to respondents No.1 to 3 only.
6. At this stage, Mr. Karan Garg, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and has no objection if appropriate directions are given for deciding the representation submitted by the petitioners.
7. Therefore, without examining the question of legality and validity of their marriage and expressing any opinion thereon, the petition is disposed of with the directions to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Rohtak to look into the grievance of the petitioners as set out in the petition and the same be treated as representation and take appropriate action for protection of their lives and liberty as may be warranted by the circumstances in accordance with law.

31.12.2024
Sonia

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No