

**CRM-M-25178 of 2016**

**[1]**

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Sr. No. 110

**CRM-M-25178 of 2016**

**Date of decision: July 26, 2016**

Nandini and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

.... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH**

**Present:** Petitioners in person along with  
Mr. Gautam Diwan, 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 respondent Nos. 4 to 6 as they feel apprehension of danger at the hands of respondent Nos. 4 to 6 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, Ms. Neelam Kashyap, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana. Copy of the petition be supplied to learned State counsel during the course of day.
4. As per the version unfolded by the petitioners, they are

**CRM-M-25178 of 2016**

**[2]**

\*\*\*\*\*

major in age and have solemnized marriage on July 22, 2016. In support thereof, they have placed on record marriage certificate Annexure P-3 and photographs Annexure P-4.

5. 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- Superintendent of Police, Karnal (Haryana) to look into the grievances narrated in their representation dated July 22, 2016 (Annexure P-5) 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.

6. 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 26, 2016**

*Ankur*

**(JASPAL SINGH)  
JUDGE**