

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-1062 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.08.2017

BALWANT KAUR AND ANOTHER.

... *Petitioners*

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS.

...*Respondents*

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH.

Present: Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate,
 for the petitioners.

 Mr. C.L. Pawar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

 Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate,
 for respondent No. 6.

1. *Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporter or not.*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?*

KULDIP SINGH, J (ORAL)

The petitioners by way of the present petition, filed under Section 482 Cr. P.C., have prayed for issuance of direction to respondents No. 1 to 4 to protect their life and liberty and that of family members from the hands of respondents No. 5 and 6 and investigate the matter on the representation dated 12.10.2016 (*Annexure P-1*).

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that Gurpreet Singh son of petitioner No. 2-Satnam Singh has married one Radha against the wishes of petitioners on 25.06.2014. But due to differences, Radha has started living with her parents and the petitioners have already disqualified Gurpreet Singh and Radha. Now, the claim of the petitioners before this Court is that they should not be harassed unnecessarily by calling them at Police Station.

The State in the reply has denied the fact that the petitioners were called to the police station.

In the circumstances, without going into the merits of the present petition, the same is disposed of with a direction to the respondents No. 1 to 4 that the petitioners shall not to be called to the police station except by way of issuing notice under Section 160 Cr. P.C. stating the reasons as to why their presence is required.

August 21, 2017
Suresh Kumar

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	✓ Yes	/	No ✓
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	Yes	/	No