

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

CRM No.M-13078 of 2016

Date of Decision: April 21, 2016

Nimmy Walia and another

.... Petitioners

vs.

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Petitioners are in person with their counsel
Mr. J.S. Bhinder.

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Mr. Devender Arya, Advocate has appeared on his own on behalf of respondent Nos.4 and 5, who are parents of petitioner No.1.

At the request of learned counsel for respondent Nos.4 and 5, respondent Nos.4 and 5 were allowed to talk to petitioner No.1 for some time in the Court. The case was again taken up. Respondent Nos.4 and 5 have objection to the marriage of petitioner No.1 with petitioner No.2.

Petitioners, who are stated to be major, claim that they have married against the wishes of their parents on 11.04.2016. The photographs of the marriage have been placed on file as Annexure-P-4. The true typed copy of aadhar card of petitioner No.1 and true typed copy of PAN card of petitioner No.2, showing their date of birth have been placed on file as Annexures-P-1 and P-2 respectively. The marriage certificate has been placed on file as Annexure P-3.

It is claimed that the petitioners have moved an application dated 11.04.2016 (Annexure-P-5) before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Mohali, for protecting their life and liberty as they apprehend danger to their life from the private respondents.

In these circumstances, petition is disposed of with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Mohali, to consider the application of the petitioners dated 11.04.2016 (Annexure-P-5) and assess the threat perception to the life and liberty of the petitioners and if it is found that there is danger to the life of the petitioners, necessary steps be taken to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

However, it is made clear that this order shall not be taken to be the proof of valid marriage.

Disposed of accordingly.

April 21, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE