

118
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-11435 of 2016 (O/M)
Date of decision : 4.4.2016

Nandini Nayyar and another Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Petitioners in person with Ms. Anju Bansal, Advocate, for,
Ms. H.K. Sandhu, Advocate.

Respondents No. 4 and 5 in person (father and mother
respectively of petitioner No. 1) with Ms. Rashi Gosain,
Advocate.

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Petitioners claim that petitioner No. 1 was born on 15.3.1990 and 26 years of age, whereas petitioner No. 2 was born on 11.10.1989 and also more than 26 years of age. Both the petitioners claim that they had married on 30.3.2016 against the wishes of parents of petitioner No.1. Now, they apprehend threat to their life and liberty at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 7 and pray for protection.

During the course of hearing, respondents No. 4 and 5, who are father and mother respectively of petitioner No. 1, alongwith their counsel appeared in Court today and requested this Court that they accept the marriage and that they should be allowed to request

CRM No. M-11435 of 2016 (O/M)

-2-

the petitioners to perform the marriage as per the social customs. It being so, respondents No. 4 and 5 were allowed to interact with petitioners, particularly petitioner No. 1 in Court room itself. They interacted with both the petitioners for about half an hour, after which again the case was taken up. Petitioner No. 1 again insisted that she cannot trust respondents No. 4 and 5 and seeks protection to their life and liberty on the ground that on the earlier occasion, she was badly beaten by respondents No. 4 and 5. Therefore, she prays that protection should be granted to them (petitioners) as well as to her in-laws. Petitioner No. 2 is stated to be working in American Express and petitioner No. 1 is stated to be housewife.

It being so, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar-respondent No. 2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 7. However, if any of the family member of petitioner No. 2 make similar request, the same shall also be considered by the Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, and appropriate action be taken. However, this order shall not be construed as a recognition of valid marriage between the parties.

Disposed of accordingly.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

4.4.2016
sjks