

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

CRM-M-19970 of 2016.
Decided on:-02.06.2016.

Khushi Mehta and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. Chander Shekhar, Advocate for
Mr. P.P.S. Duggall, Advocate
for the petitioners.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for issuance of directions to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioner No.2 is son of Lakhbir Singh. However, due to typographical mistake, the words “son of” could not be mentioned in the Memo of Parties.

Let the name of petitioner No.2 be read as “Sandeep Singh son of Lakhbir Singh” instead of “Sandeep Singh Lakhbir Singh”. Registry is directed to carry out necessary correction in the Memo of Parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that the petitioners are major and have solemnized their marriage in accordance with law. However, respondents No.4 to 6 are not accepting their marriage and are adamant to separate them from each other by resorting to illegal means. Learned counsel further submits that in view of imminent danger to the life and liberty of the petitioners, they had moved a representation dated 28.5.2016 (Annexure P-3) to the respondent No.3 i.e. Commissioner of Police, Amritsar.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only at this stage.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of these respondents.

Let requisite number of copies of paper book be given to learned State counsel during the course of the day.

Without going into the validity of the marriage, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent No.2 to take appropriate remedial measures, as warranted by law, on the representation dated 28.5.2016 (Annexure P-3) submitted by the petitioners.

In the meantime, necessary order be passed to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

June 02, 2016
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE