



2026:AHC:126858

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 23183 of 2026

Sanjana And Another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Saurabh Tripathi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 38

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for petitioners and learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.
2. By way of the present writ petition, a direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents not to interfere in peaceful marital life of petitioners, has been sought.
3. Upon perusal of the pleadings, this Court does not find any serious threat perception to the petitioners and, therefore, there is no requirement of passing any order for providing police protection to them in light of judgment rendered by Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of **Lata Singh Vs. State of U.P. & Anr. (AIR 2006 SC 2522)**, wherein it has been held that the courts are not meant to provide protection to such youths, who have simply fled to marry according to their own wishes.
4. There is no material or reason for this Court to conclude that the petitioners' life and liberty are at peril. There is not even an iota of evidence to evince that private respondents (relatives of either of the petitioners) are likely to cause physical or mental assault to the petitioners.
5. In a deserving case, the Court can provide security to the couple, but cannot lend them the support they have sought. They have to learn to support each other and face the society.
6. If any person misbehaves or manhandles them, the Courts and police authorities are there to come to their rescue, but they cannot claim security

as a matter of course or right.

7. Needless to observe that petitioners have already moved a representation before the concerned police officials and in case the concerned police finds a real threat perception, he will do the needful in accordance with law.

8. It is also observed that no specific application in shape of information preferred before the concerned police authorities for lodging any FIR against any illegal conduct carried out by the private respondents, if that be so, and no heed has ever been paid by the concerned police authorities, there is no specific averment available in the petition that any case has been instituted in pursuance to Section 175(3) of BNSS.

9. In view thereof, no case made out for seeking indulgence of the Court over the prayer as made in the petition, hence, the same is hereby **disposed of**.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

June 11, 2026

Pramod Tripathi