



CRWP-4227-2026

-1-

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

148

CRWP-4227-2026

Date of decision : 10.04.2026

Anshpreet Kaur and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. R.S. Basra, Advocate for the petitioners.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been preferred by the petitioners, under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of *mandamus*, directing the official respondents No.1 to 4 to protect their life and liberty as they apprehend danger from private respondents No.5 to 10. It is stated in the petition that petitioners have performed their marriage, which is against the will of private respondents and they have apprehension that the private respondents might cause physical harm to them.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners being major, got married against the wishes of private respondents. Ever since then, the petitioners are being threatened with dire consequences by the private respondents. Resultantly, a representation/complaint dated 09.04.2026 (Annexure P-5) was also made to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Batala, wherein a mention has been made about the alleged threat perception. Learned counsel submits that despite the official



CRWP-4227-2026

-2-

respondents having been communicated about the alleged threat perception, no steps have been taken to come to the rescue of the petitioners. Learned counsel submits that he would be satisfied if directions are issued to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Batala to look into their representation/complaint dated 09.04.2026 (Annexure P-5) and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 4 only.
4. At the asking of the Court, Mr. Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4.
5. Keeping in view the mandate of the Supreme Court in the case of **“Lata Singh Vs. State of U.P. and another”**, JT 2006 (6) SC 173, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Batala to look into the matter and take appropriate action in accordance with law to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.
6. It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as a stamp of this Court about the marriage of the parties and no opinion with regard to the validity of the marriage has been expressed in this order.

April 10, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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