

**CRWP-4015-2026**

1

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

118

**CRWP-4015-2026****Decided on: 10.04.2026****Sonia and another****.....Petitioners****Versus****State U.T. Chandigarh and others****.....Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Dhanvinder Singh Niggha, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Narender Vashisth, Addl. P.P., U.T. Chandigarh.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**

1. Prayer in the instant petition, filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of direction to the official respondents to provide protection of lives and liberty to the petitioners, who have married against the wishes of the private respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have solemnized marriage against the wishes of their family members, who are threatening and interfering in the matrimonial life of the petitioners. It is the first marriage of both 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 **03.04.2026 Annexure P-7)**, to respondent No.2, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, following was recorded vide order dated 09.04.2026:



CRWP-4015-2026

2

*“1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioners, for issuance of direction to the official respondents, to protect their life and liberty from the hands of private respondents.*

*2. Upon noticing that petitioner No.2, namely Abhijeet Kumar, is primarily a resident of the State of Bihar, this Court queried learned counsel for the petitioners regarding the place where both the petitioners ordinarily reside.*

*3. In response, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, at present, both the petitioners are apprehensive about threats to their life and liberty at the hands of the private respondents; therefore, he is unable to disclose their exact place of residence. 4. However, learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn attention of this Court to paragraph No.3 of the present petition, which is reproduced here below:-*

***“3. That both the petitioners were known to each other since three years and both the petitioners were interested in marriage so they decided to discuss about this at their home regarding their marriage. But Father, Mother and other relatives of petitioner girl refused to perform their marriage. Petitioner No.1 is 10+2 and serving in a private company named 'Mysanskritam', whereas the Petitioner No.2 is also 10+2 and serving in Shaam Fashion Mall, Sector 34, Chandigarh and earning well.”***

*5. Notice of motion.*

*6. On advance notice, Mr. Narender Vashisth, Addl. PP, UT, Chandigarh, puts an appearance on behalf of the respondent/State, and seeks some time to verify the contentions addressed by counsel for the petitioners, today before this Court.*

*7. List again on 10.04.2026.”*

4. Learned counsel for the respondent/U.T. had appeared yesterday, and for the purpose of verification of the aforesaid directions,

**CRWP-4015-2026**

3

the matter was adjourned. Today, he informs that both the petitioners are working in U.T. Chandigarh and are also residing therein. In view of the same, the petition can be considered for the prayer made therein.

5. In view of the foregoing, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to Respondent No. 2, The Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh to examine the representation dated 03.04.2026 (P-7) concerning the alleged threat perception. It is noticed that, as per the status report, no threat perception has been observed. Nevertheless, if any substance is found in the representation, Respondent shall take necessary measures in accordance with the law to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not endangered by the private respondents.

It is further clarified that, while considering the petitioners' representation, their credentials shall also be duly examined.

6. However, this direction shall not be construed as validating the marriage allegedly solemnized between the parties, nor shall it affect any civil or criminal proceedings that may be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**April 10, 2026**  
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**  
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**