

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Date of decision:15.5.2017

Supriya Chaubey and another

... Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: None for the petitioners.
Mr.Rajesh Mehta, Addl.AG, Punjab
...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jaswinder Singh, submits that petitioner no.2 is actually not residing at the address given in the memo of parties, i.e. at Sarkar Pati, Village Charik, District Moga, as confirmed by respondent no.3, i.e. the SHO, Police Station Charik, District Moga. He is, in fact, stated to have left the village at the age of approximately 10 years, i.e. about 13 years back, after the death of his father, with his mother stated to have been residing with another person. He is stated to be residing at the house of his maternal aunt in Delhi, though at an unknown address.

The aforesaid information is stated to have been obtained by the SHO from the Panchayat of Village Charik.

It is also stated that an FIR has been found to be registered against petitioner no.2 at Police Station Gorakhpur Cantt., District Gorakhpur (UP), alleging therein that he has taken away petitioner no.1 against her wishes from the custody of her parents.

In view of the fact that the petitioners are not found to be

residing at the address given by them in the memo of parties, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents no.2 to 4 to ensure that the lives of the petitioners would continue to be protected, such right to life being a fundamental right enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. As regards their liberty, it would be protected within the four corners of law.

15.5.2017
pk

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No