

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12839 of 2016
DECIDED ON: April 12, 2016

JASPREET KAUR & ANR.

....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

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?

Present: Petitioners in person along with
Mr. Vinay Kumar, Advocate.

Respondents No. 4 to 6 in person.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

This is a petition preferred under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure by Jaspreet Kaur and Ravinder Singh-petitioners, seeking direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their lives and personal liberty, by providing adequate security/protection as they have allegedly solemnized marriage against the wish and consent of respondents No. 4 to 6.

2. Notice of motion.

3. At the asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Sekhon, AAG, Punjab has accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State whereas Mr. Ashok Gupta, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent

No. 4. Copy of the paper book has been supplied to learned State

counsel.

4. During the course of proceedings, the parties have been interviewed. Petitioner No.1 Jaspreet Kaur though stated that she has solemnized marriage with respondent No.2 Ravinder Singh but she does not want to accompany him from the Court, rather, she intends to accompany respondent No.6-Sukhjinder Singh, who is none else but her real maternal uncle. She has further stated in categorical terms that she has no threat or apprehension, at the hands of their parents and maternal uncle i.e. respondents No. 4 to 6.

5. Since, petitioner No.1-Jaspreet Kaur is major, she is set at liberty and is free to accompany either her parents or her maternal uncle.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, petition preferred on behalf of petitioner No.1-Jaspreet Kaur has rendered infructuous and the same is accordingly disposed of as such.

7. As far as the apprehension to the life and liberty of petitioner No.2-Ravinder Singh, at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6 is concerned, it can be said that there could be some apprehension to his life and liberty and in such circumstances, he deserves protection.

8. Thus, instant petition qua petitioner No.2-Ravinder Singh is disposed of with the direction that in case, petitioner No.2 approaches respondents No. 2 and 3 for his security, after considering the various factors and the threat perception, he would be provided necessary security.

April 12, 2016
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE