

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No.M-11745 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: April 26, 2017

Harpreet Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate, for respondent no.4.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Upon notice issued, Mr. Rajesh Mehta, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions from ASI Baljit Singh and ASI Narinder Singh, submits that the petitioners have recorded their statement before the police of Police Station Chatiwind, District Amritsar, to the effect that the matter has been amicably settled with respondents no.4 and 6 and as such, the petitioners no longer require any protection.

However, Mr Mehta also submits that two police officials from the police station went to the place of residence of respondents no.4 and 6 as shown in the memo of parties, wherein they were told by the paternal uncle of petitioner no.1 that the said respondents no longer reside in Village Varpal, i.e. the village given as the address of the aforesaid respondents.

Mr. Rajiv Kataria, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.4, who is stated to be the mother of petitioner no.1, has submitted that the mother has no grievance with regard to the marriage of the petitioners with each other; however, petitioner no.1 had actually initiated criminal

proceedings against respondent no.4, i.e. her mother, at the time when she was 13 years old, alleging therein that she was being forced into prostitution by her mother in connivance with the brother of the second petitioner.

Respondent no.4 is stated to have been convicted pursuant to such criminal proceedings, though her sentence has been suspended upon an appeal having been filed by her before this Court.

Without making any comment on the aforesaid contention, in view of the fact that the petitioners are admittedly above the legally marriageable age, this petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

April 26, 2017
vcgarg

(**Amol Rattan Singh**)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No