

117
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-13360 of 2016 (O/M)
Date of decision : 23.4.2016

Anu and another Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Petitioners in person with Mr. Robin Bansal, Advocate.
Respondent No. 5 in person (mother petitioner No. 1)
with Mr. G.S. Simble, Advocate.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

At the time of hearing, Sukhanpal Kaur, respondent No. 5 (mother of petitioner No. 1) had sought time to talk to her daughter. Accordingly, she was allowed 15 minutes to talk to her daughter in the Court room itself. The petitioners have insisted for protection.

Petitioners, who are stated to be major, claim that they have married against the wishes of their parents on 18.4.2016. The photographs of the marriage have been placed on file as

CRM No. M-13360 of 2016 (O/M)

-2-

Annexure-P-3. The true typed copies of Matriculation Examination Certificates, showing the date of birth of petitioner No. 1 and petitioner No. 2, have been placed on file as Annexures-P-1 and P-2 respectively.

It is claimed that the petitioners have moved an application dated 18.4.2016 (Annexure-P-4) before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala-respondent No. 2, for protecting their life and liberty as they apprehend danger to their life from the private respondents No. 4 to 7.

In these circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala-respondent No. 2, to consider the application of the petitioners dated 18.4.2016 (Annexure-P-4) 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, this order shall not be construed as a recognition of valid marriage between the parties.

Disposed of accordingly.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

23.4.2016
sjks