



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT GWALIOR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE G. S. AHLUWALIA

ON THE 9th OF APRIL, 2025

WRIT PETITION No. 12560 of 2025

SMT PRIYANKA RAWAT AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Kamlesh Kumar Kori – Advocate for petitioners.

Shri S S Kushwaha – Government Advocate for respondent/State.

ORDER

This petition, under Article 226 of Constitution of India, has been filed seeking following relief(s):

1. That, competent police authorities/respondents be directed to provide necessary police protection to the limb and life of the petitioners who are legally wedded couple in the interest of justice within a reasonable time period.
2. That, respondents/police authority be also directed not to falsely implicate the petitioners no. 2 and his family members in a false criminal case at the behest of family members of petitioner no.1.



2. It is submitted by counsel for petitioners that petitioners are major and are of marriageable age. They have performed marriage on 02.04.2025 and immediately thereafter they sent a complaint to the police complaining that they have an apprehension to their life from the family members of petitioner No.1. Accordingly, it is prayed that in the light of judgment passed by Supreme Court in the case of **Lata Singh Vs. State of U.P. and Another** reported in (2006) **5 SCC 475**, they may be granted police protection.

3. However, during the course of arguments, it was conceded by counsel for petitioners that they do not want services of PSOs and they confine their prayer only to the effect that in case if any complaint with regard to missing person of petitioner No.1 is lodged, then before registering the same as FIR, the Police must conduct a preliminary enquiry and may be directed to proceed only after recording statements of petitioners.

4. *Per contra*, petition is vehemently opposed by counsel for respondent/State. It is submitted that now a days it has become an eighth ritual of marriage. In the present case, it appears that petitioners after getting married immediately rushed to the post office to send the complaint. If they were so apprehensive of some criminal act by their parents, then how they could succeed in getting married. Therefore, the complaint which has been made by petitioners is misconceived and false even to the knowledge of petitioners.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. It is true that number of writ petitions are being filed for police protection by making a vague complaint immediately after performing marriage. It is very difficult for this Court to find out as to which petition is



frivolous and which depicts the real cause. However, it is for the litigants to think as to whether the frivolous petitions should be filed or not.

7. Be that whatever it may be.

8. Since petitioners have confined their arguments to the effect that if any Gum Insaan report is lodged in respect of petitioner No.1 then police should conduct a preliminary enquiry and only after recording statements of petitioners should proceed further, therefore, this petition is *disposed of* with a direction that if any Gum Insaan Report is lodged, then Police shall conduct a preliminary enquiry and shall proceed further only after recording the statements of petitioners and shall also verify as to whether the petitioners are of marriageable age and whether they have performed marriage in accordance with law.

(G. S. AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE