

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

CRM No.M- 6656 of 2016

Date of Decision: February 24, 2016

Swati Mehta and another

.... Petitioners

vs.

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Petitioners are in person with their counsel
Mr. A.K. Handa

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

On behalf of respondent No.4 and 7 (father and paternal uncle of petitioner No.1 respectively) Mr. Vineet Chaudhary, Advocate has put in appearance. On his request respondent No.4 was allowed to talk with petitioner No.1. Thereafter, the matter was taken up after some time. It is stated that after talking some time with her father (respondent No.4), petitioner No.1 does not want to talk any more with him.

Petitioners, who are stated to be major, claim that they have married against the wishes of their parents on 22.02.2016. The photographs of the marriage have been placed on file as Annexure-P-3. The true typed copy of Secondary School Examination Certificate of petitioner No.1 and true typed copy of aahar card of petitioner No.2, showing their date of birth have been placed on file as Annexures-P-1 and P-2 respectively. The marriage certificate has been placed on file as Annexue P-4.

It is claimed that the petitioners have moved an application dated 22.02.2016 (Annexure-P-5) before the Senior Superintendent of Police, S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali, for protecting their life and liberty as they apprehend danger to their life from the private respondents.

In these circumstances, petition is disposed of with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police, S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali, to consider the application of the petitioners dated 22.02.2016 (Annexure-P-5) and assess the threat perception to the life and liberty of the petitioners and if it is found that there is danger to the life of the petitioners, necessary steps be taken to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

However, it is made clear that this order shall not be taken to be the proof of valid marriage.

Disposed of accordingly.

February 24, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE