

CRM-M-28743 of 2016

[1]

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

Sr. No. 117

CRM No.M-28743 of 2016

Date of decision: August 19, 2016

Raveena Kumari and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Petitioners in person along with
Mr. R.S. Sekhon, Advocate.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By virtue of the instant petition preferred under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have sought issuance of directions to respondent Nos. 2 & 3 to protect their lives and liberty at the hands of respondent Nos. 4 to 8 and their relatives, by providing them security.

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

3. At the asking of Court, Mr. P.S. Paul, DAG, 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. At this juncture, Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.4 and requested for a meeting of respondent No.4 with her daughter i.e. petitioner No1-Raveena Kumari.

CRM-M-28743 of 2016

[2]

Prayer is allowed. It has further been submitted by learned counsel for respondent No.4 that after meeting respondent No.4 has left the Court.

5. As per the version unfolded by the petitioners, they are major in age and have solemnized marriage on August 16, 2016. In support thereof, they have placed on record marriage certificate Annexure P-3 and photographs Annexure P-4.

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, Jalandhar (Punjab) to look into the grievances narrated in their representation dated August 16, 2016 (Annexure P-5) and to take appropriate action in accordance with law to ensure that no harm is caused to the lives 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.

August 19, 2016
Ankur

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No