



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

CRWP-5697-2026

Date of decision : 14.05.2026

Anu and another

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Ms. Sandeep Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for directing respondents No.1 to 3 to provide adequate security and protection to the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondents No.4 to 6. Further prayer has been made for directing respondents No.2 and 3 not to harass and interfere in the peaceful married life of the petitioners and not to intrude into the privacy of the petitioners by raiding their house time and again.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that both the petitioners are major and have married against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 6 and have sought protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 6. Their marriage certificate and photographs evidencing their marriage are on record as Annexure P-3 and P-4. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that petitioners have filed representation dated 13.05.2026 (Annexure P-5) before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar for the redressal of their claim and the same has not yet been decided.



3. Notice of motion to the official respondents.
4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Ekompal Sagoo, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State.
5. Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar to decide the representation dated 13.05.2026 (Annexure P-5) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived. It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order would not be understood having expressed any opinion whatsoever by this Court on the validity of the marriage of the petitioners.
6. Disposed of.

14.05.2026
m. sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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