

CRM-M-24464 of 2016

[1]

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

Sr. No. 111

CRM-M-24464 of 2016

Date of decision: July 21, 2016

Bandna and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Petitioners in person along with
Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate.

JASPAL SINGH, J

By virtue of the instant petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have sought issuance of directions to respondents No. 1 to 3 to protect their lives and liberty at the hands of respondents Nos. 4 & 5 as they feel apprehension of danger at the hands of respondents Nos. 4 & 5 and their relatives, by providing them security.

2. Notice to respondents No.1 to 3, only at this stage.

3. At the asking of Court, Mr. RPS Sidhu, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Punjab. Copy of the petition be supplied to learned State counsel during the course of day.

4. As per the case unfolded by the petitioners, they are major in age and have solemnized marriage on July 17, 2016. In support

CRM-M-24464 of 2016

[2]

thereof, they have placed on record marriage certificate Annexure P-4 and photographs Annexure P-5.

5. It would be pertinent to mention here that petitioner No.1- Vanda Devi was earlier married to Bharat Bhushan but their marriage stands dissolved by way of mutual consent vide judgment and decree dated September 19, 2014, subsequent thereto she solemnised the marriage with petitioner No.2 – Gaurav on July 17, 2016.

6. Without expressing any opinion on the validity of the marriage and keeping in view the mandate of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Lata Singh Vs. State of U.P. and another, JT 2006 (6) SC 173**, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.2- Senior Superintendent of Police, Hoshiarpur (Punjab) to look into the grievances narrated in their representation dated July 17, 2016 (Annexure P-6) and to take appropriate action in accordance with law to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.

7. This order shall not be construed to be conferring the legitimacy or authenticity to the factum of marriage having been performed as well as their age, as the Court is clearly deprived of any means to determine the aforesaid facts.

July 21, 2016

Ankur

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**