

IOIN-CRM-M No.23872 of 2014

Haseena and another

vs.

State of Haryana and others

Present : None for the petitioners.

Mr. Munish Sharma, Asstt. Advocate General, Haryana
for respondents No.1 & 2-State.

None for respondents No. 3 to 5.

Learned State Counsel with all fairness has conceded to at the bar that there has been due compliance of the directions earlier issued by this Court to the official respondents to protect the life and personal liberty of the petitioners who were in peril at the hands of the private respondents.

As is reflected from the records of the case disposed off earlier vide orders dated 4th August, 2014 this Court has had directed to release the petitioners from the Protection Home where they were earlier sent.

Since, there has been adequate redressal of the grievance of the petitioners and sufficient protection to life and personal liberty has been ordered as is guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

Mere non-adherence as per the office report by not depositing the amount by way of FDR as earlier ordered by this Court is not a legitimate and permissible ground to deny the couple their constitutional right, thus there is no necessity for calling the petitioner to deposit the amount, as such the IO stands disposed off.

September 02, 2016
Dpr

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE