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

CRM-M-45013 of 2016

Date of decision: December 15, 2016

Ruma Devi and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Petitioners in person along with
Mr. Rajesh Duhan, Advocate.

JASPAL SINGH, J (Oral)

By virtue of instant petition preferred 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 No. 4 and 5 as they feel apprehension of danger at the hands of respondents No. 4 and 5 and their relatives, by providing them security.

2. Notice of motion.

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. Mr. Manoj Kumar Taya, Advocate has also appeared on behalf of respondent No.4, who is the mother of petitioner No.1 and requested that she wants to have a talk with petitioners. She was asked to sit and have a

talk with the petitioners and after some time, it has been submitted by learned counsel for respondent No.4 that there is no threat extended by respondent No.4 to the lives and liberty of the petitioners.

5. Since, both the petitioners belong to the same village and are alleged to have solemnized marriage, there might be some apprehension to their lives and liberty.

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- Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, District Kaithal, Haryana, to look into the grievances narrated in their representation dated 14.12.2016 (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.

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.

December 15, 2016

sonika

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No