

118

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARHCRWP-6863-2025  
Date of decision: 30.06.2025

SURESH SINGH AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

**Versus**

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**Present: Mr. A.S. Gulati, Advocate  
for the petitioners.


Ms. Ambika Sood, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI, J (Oral):**

1. Petitioners Suresh Singh and Nekha Rani have filed present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus for directing respondents No.1 to 3 for providing protection of life and liberty and security to petitioners, who are married since 25.06.2025 and for directing respondent Nos.1 to 3 for restraining respondent No.4 to 5 not to interfere in their personal life and liberty, with further prayer to decide representation dated 25.06.2025 (Annexure P-5).

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. As per copy of Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 1 (Annexure P-1), his date of birth is 20.12.1999. On the other hand, as per copy of Aadhaar Card of petitioner No.2 (Annexure P-2), her date of birth is 05.04.2001. They had performed marriage on 25.06.2025. Copy of Certificate of Marriage is Annexure P-3 and photographs regarding performing of their marriage are Annexure P-4. Petitioners also moved representation to the Superintendent of Police,



District Kaithal, Haryana, which is Annexure P-5. Petitioners had performed marriage without consent and wishes of parents of petitioner No.2 and as such they are receiving threats from respondents No. 4 and 5.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On advance notice, Ms. Ambika Sood, Addl. A.G., Haryana, appears and accepts notice on behalf of State.

5. Considering nature of litigation, no purpose would be served by serving notice to private respondents.

6. I have considered the facts narrated in petition, according to which both petitioners are major and they have performed marriage against wishes of parents of petitioner No.2, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hand of respondents No. 4 and 5. It is duty of police to protect life and liberty of petitioners. Therefore, respondents No.1 to 3 are directed to consider representation of petitioners dated 25.06.2025 (Annexure P-5) and protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 4 and 5, considering threat perception, with further direction to maintain their privacy and dignity.

7. Aforesaid protection order will have no bearing on legality and validity of marriage and it will not protect them in case there is any violation of law or pending legal proceedings.

8. Petition is accordingly disposed of.

**(AMARJOT BHATTI)**  
**JUDGE**

30.06.2025

monika

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes /No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes /No