

106

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.16368 of 2015
Date of Decision: 20.05.2015

SANJEEV JAIN

.....Petitioner

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Gourave Bhayyia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner is the father of Bhavika Jain who has performed run away marriage with respondent No.4. Thereafter they filed **CRM-M No.13125 of 2015** in which following order was passed:-

"Petitioners seeks protection qua their lives and liberty from being invaded by respondents No.4 to 8. Petitioner No.1 is proved to be minor. Without commenting upon validity of marriage of the petitioners, it would be just and appropriate to refer their representation for consideration of respondent No.2. The petitioners are alleged to have solemnized marriage on 21.04.2015 at Mahadev Mandir, Haibowal Kalan, Ludhiana as per Hindu

Rights and ceremonies. The petitioners have also produced few photographs of marriage ceremony in the aforesaid context.

At this stage without dilating upon the issue of validity of marriage, respondent No.2 would be obligated to consider the grievance of the petitioners and if need be, pass appropriate orders in respect of protection of lives and liberty of the petitioners in accordance with law.

Disposed of.”

In the aforesaid order this Court only created obligation on respondent No.2 to consider the grouse of run away couple and in the event of finding any reasonable apprehension, protect their lives and liberty.

It is clarified that the aforesaid order in any case does not empower any police officer/official to commit any human right violation of petitioner or anyone else by misreading the same. Police can embark upon the inquiry so as to ascertain threat perception of run away couple but in any case petitioner cannot be summoned in odd hours in Police Station and also to raid his house without there being any culpable act on his part.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Arshdeep S. Kler, D.A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Let requisite copies of petition be supplied to him by learned counsel for the petitioner during the course of the day.

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass there is no necessity of filing reply at this stage.

Without going into the veracity of allegations as raised by the petitioner in the aforesaid manner, respondent No.2 is directed to look into the grievance of the petitioner vis-a-vis personal allegations raised against respondent No.3 and to take all remedial steps if the allegations of petitioner are found to be having some worth therein.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

May 20, 2015

Atik

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE