

226

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

**CRM-M No.33223 of 2014
Date of Decision: 12.03.2015**

Salma and another Vs. State of Haryana

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Prakash Chahar, D.A.G., Haryana.

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.

Short reply by way of affidavit of Puran Chand, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Mewat at Nuh, on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 has been filed.

Para 5 of the reply reads as under:-

"That the private respondents were also joined in the enquiry conducted by the police and statements of the private respondents were recorded by the police in which they have categorically stated that the petitioners have solemnized marriage without their consent. The private respondents have categorically stated that they are against their marriage. The private respondents have also contended in their statements that they will not raise any dispute in this regard and shall abide by the order and decisions passed by the Hon'ble High Court. The statements of respondent No.5 is annexed as annexure R-1 for kind perusal of this Hon'ble court and statement of Samina Sarpanch Gram Panchayat Malab, P.S. Nuh is

annexed as annexure R-2 being annexed for the kind perusal of the Hon'ble court. The joint statement of respondent No.8 to 14 is annexed as annexure R-3 which is being annexed for the kind perusal of the Hon'ble court. It is also pertinent to mention here that the private respondent No.5, 8 to 14 and Sarpanch Gram Panchayat Malab has categorically stated that they will not endanger the life and liberty of the petitioners. However, the petitioners are not residing in the village Malab, District Nuh presently. They are also not appearing before the police to make their statements.”

The afore-said reply reveals that the statements of numbers of persons including Sarpanch of the Gram Panchayat, Malab have been recorded by the Police and they all have stated that they will not endanger the life and property of the petitioners, however the petitioners were not found residing in the village. And despite hectic search to locate the petitioners they could not be traced out and have not appeared before the Police to make their statements.

Keeping in view the entirety of the facts and circumstances, this Court still feels that the Police may take all preventive steps to safeguard life, liberty and property of the petitioners in case some information to this effect is brought to the notice of the respondents No.2 and 3.

With the aforesaid observation, petition stands disposed of.

March 12, 2015.

Atik

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE