

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

Criminal Misc. No.M-5700 of 2016
Date of Decision:-02.03.2016

Sumitra Rani and another

..Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

1. *Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?*
2. *To be referred to reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Present:- Mr. Prabhjot Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sultan Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for issuance of directions to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 & 5.

Pusuant to the order dated 16.02.2016 passed by this Court, learned counsel for the petitoners produced a photocopy of a FDR for an amount of Rs.50,000/- in the name of petitioner No.1- Sumitra Rani daughter of Surjit Singh in Court today, the same is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioner No.2 is a poor person and was hardly able to arrange an amount of Rs.50,000/-.

Learned counsel for the State submits that the both the petitioners have made statements, wherein, it was stated that they do not have any threat to their life and liberty from the other side. Similar statement of respondent No. 4-Surjit Singh, who is father of petitioner No.1 was also recorded, wherein, he has stated that he does not have any objection to the matrimonial alliance. Besides this, statement of Nachhatar Singh Sarpanch of village, have also been recorded, wherein, he has taken responsibility that no oppression will be allowed to cause to the girl-petitioner No.1 The said statements of both the petitioners and respondent No. 4-Surjit Singh as well as the statement of Nachhatar Singh Sarpanch of village, produced in Court today, are taken on record.

Taking into consideration the financial condition of peittioner No.2-Raj Singh, order dated 16.02.2016 passed by this Court is modified to the extent that, as against the required amount of Rs.1,00,000/-, FDR for an amount of Rs. 50,000/- is accepted.

In view of the above, without commenting upon the merits of the case and validity of marriage and taking into consideration the above facts and circumstances of this case, no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition and same is accordingly disposed of.

However, in case the petitioners still apprehend any threat to their life and liberty, they are at liberty to approach concerned SSP, who shall take necessary steps for redressal of their grievance in accordance with law.

02.03.2016
Anjal

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE