

**CRM-M-38548 of 2016**

**[1]**

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Sr. No. 114

**CRM No.M-38548 of 2016**

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

Swaran Jeet Kaur and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

.... Respondents

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

**Present:** Petitioners in person along with  
Mr. Shalender Mohan, 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. 1 to 4 to protect their lives and liberty at the hands of respondent Nos. 5 to 8 and their relatives, by providing them security.

2. Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 4, 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. As per the version unfolded by the petitioners, they are major in age and have solemnized marriage on October 22, 2016 and are residing at Malout. In support thereof, they have placed on record marriage certificate Annexure P-3 and photographs of marriage Annexure P-4.

**CRM-M-38548 of 2016**

**[2]**

\*\*\*\*\*

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 the direction to respondent No.3- Senior Superintendent of Police, Sri Mukatsar Sahib (Punjab) to look into the grievances narrated in their representation dated October 22, 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.

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 26, 2016**  
*Ankur*

**(JASPAL SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**Whether Speaking/Reasoned**

**Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable**

**Yes/No**