



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<p><u>WPCRL/566/2026</u></p> <p>Vanshika Tomar and Another --Petitioners Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondents</p> <p><u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u></p> <p>Mr. Tajhar Qayyum, Advocate for the petitioners.</p> <p>2. Mr. Vikas Uniyal, Brief Holder for the State.</p> <p>3. Mr. Pranav Singh, learned counsel for the private respondent nos. 3 to 6.</p> <p>4. Petitioners have approached this Court seeking the following relief:-</p> <p>“a) Issue a Writ, Order or Direction in the nature of Mandamus directing respondent nos. 1 to 2 to provide the necessary protection to the petitioners from respondents and their associates.”</p> <p>5. Father and mother of petitioner no. 1 are present before this Court today.</p> <p>6. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that both the petitioners are major and they have solemnized their marriage on 24.03.2026. As per the matriculation certificate of petitioner no.1, her date of birth is 18.09.2006. As such, she was 19 years and 6 months old at the time of marriage while the date of birth of petitioner no.2 as per his matriculation</p>



certificate is 05.03.2006 and he was also 20 years old at the time of marriage. It is further submitted that since the family members of petitioner no. 1 are against this marriage, they are giving out threats to kill both the petitioners. It is also submitted that petitioners are facing stiff resistance, and they seriously apprehend threat to their life and limb from their family members, and hence they are before this Court praying for protection.

7. Learned counsel for the private respondents would submit that petitioner no. 2 has not attained the age of 21 years and as such the marriage alleged to have been solemnized between the petitioners is not a valid marriage.

8. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that though at the time of solemnization of marriage, petitioner no. 2 have not attained the age of 21 years which is the eligibility age of marriage of a male but despite this fact at the most, the marriage could be voidable.

9. Be that as it may, the Coordinate Bench vide its order dated 08.05.2026 directed the parties to appear before the counsellor. The parties appeared before the counsellor and the report submitted by the counsellor would indicate that the petitioner no. 1 is not ready to go with her parents and she is happy with the company of the petitioner no. 2.

10. In that view of the matter, and in view of the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Lata Singh Vs State of U.P. and another, (2006) 5 SCC 475, the



petitioners have made out a case for grant of protection.

11. The Station House Officer, Police Station Buggawala, District Haridwar is directed to assess the threat, if any, to the life and limb of the petitioners, and provide necessary protection, if it is found that there is a threat to the life and limb of the petitioners. The S.H.O. concerned is further directed to summon the private respondents, and such other persons, who are inimically placed towards the marriage of the petitioners, and counsel them, in accordance with law.

12. The writ petition stands ordered accordingly.

(Alok Mahra J.)

01.07.2026

Ujjwal