

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

**CRM-M-13577 of 2016
DECIDED ON: April 23, 2016**

HARPREET SINGH AND ANOTHER

.....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
Ms. Amandeep Sibia, Advocate.

Respondent No.4 in person.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

Instant petition has been preferred under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure by Harpreet Singh and Vaneeta Verma- petitioners, seeking direction to respondents No. 1 to 3 to provide protection to their lives and liberty.

2. Notice of motion.

3. At the asking of Court, Mr. RPS Sidhu, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Punjab whereas Mr. Avtar Singh Bhatti, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No.4.

4. As per the averments made in this petition, the petitioners got

solemnized marriage on April 21, 2016 against the wish and consent of their parents i.e. respondents No. 4 to 8 and as such, they feel apprehension at their hands to their lives and liberty. One of the private respondents namely, Vijay Kumar-father of petitioner No.2 is present in Court and he intends to have a talk with his daughter-Vaneeta Verma-petitioner No.2.

5. Accordingly, he was allowed to sit along with his daughter-Vaneeta Verma in the premises of the Court. After about 10/15 minutes, the matter was again taken up. At that time, Vijay Kumar-respondent No.4 has submitted that he agrees to the marriage of the petitioners *inter se* but would like to perform the other ceremonies and to send petitioner No.2 from his home but still there is apprehension to the lives and liberty of the petitioners as there are other private respondents also, who may or may not agree to the marriage of the petitioners.

6. Taking into consideration the aforesaid aspects of the case and considering the threat perception, even at this stage, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala, Punjab to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioners in their representation dated April 21, 2016 (Annexure P-5) and if some substance is found, to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

7. However, this order shall not be construed as a measure to treat the marriage of the petitioners valid or legal.

April 23, 2016
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE