

109

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-44403-2015

Date of Decision: 28.12.2015

PARVEEN KUMARI AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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)

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for issuance of directions to official respondents to protect their life and liberty from the hands of private respondents.

Petitioners claim themselves to be major and have solemnized marriage against the wishes of their parents on 24.12.2015. Factum of marriage has been pleaded with reference to photographs and marriage certificate (Annexures P-3 and P-4 respectively). Petitioners feel reasonable apprehension at the hands of private respondents, who were opposing their marriage.

Precisely, for the grievance made in the present

petition, petitioners have already filed a representation before the Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar (Rural)-respondent No.2 (Annexure P-5), but no action has been taken so far.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Sukhjit Singh, Advocate appears on behalf of private respondents No.5, 6, 7 and 9 and Mr. V.P.S. Sidhu, A.A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of State. Let three copies of the petition be supplied to him by learned counsel for the petitioners during the course of the day.

Learned counsel for the private respondents No.5, 6, 7 and 9 states that the private respondents are not interfering in the alleged matrimonial status of the petitioners, however they wish to perform their marriage honourably in the village.

Be that as it may, it would be just and expedient to ask the respondent No.2 to have fair assessment of threat perception of the petitioners and in case their apprehensions are found to be *bona fide*, then take all reasonable steps to safeguard the interests of the petitioners in accordance with law.

The respondent No.2 would be within his jurisdiction to devise ways and means to arrive at fact finding report also.

Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

December 28, 2015

Atik

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE