

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

Sr. No. 122

**CRM No.M-37392 of 2016 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: October 20, 2016**

Amandeep Kaur and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

.... Respondents

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

**Present:** Petitioners in person along with  
Mr. Vikram Sheoran, Advocate.

\*\*\*\*\*

**JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

**CRM No.32940 of 2016**

Heard.

Application is allowed as prayed for.

**Main Case**

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. 1 to 3 to protect their lives and liberty at the hands of respondent Nos. 4 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, Ms. Ashima Mor, APP, Chandigarh accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of U.T. Chandigarh. 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 major in age and have solemnized marriage on October 17, 2016. In support thereof, they have placed on record photographs of marriage Annexure P-3.

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 - Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh to look into the grievances narrated in their representation dated October 17, 2016 (Annexure P-4) 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.

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.

October 20, 2016

*m. sharma*

(JASPAL SINGH)  
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No