

119

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

CRM-M No.15468 of 2017

Date of Decision: 03.05.2017

Sunita Rani and another

.....Petitioners

Vs

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. M.S. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Earlier a Criminal Writ Petition i.e. CRWP No.416 of 2017 titled Naveen Sahota Vs. State of Punjab was filed, which was decided on 26.04.2017 and the detinue/petitioner No.1 herein was ordered to be released and she was allowed to go to the place of her own choice. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that thereafter, both the petitioners have performed their marriage after converting the religion of petitioner No.1 from Hindu to Christian on 27.04.2017. Learned counsel further submits that though the aforesaid writ petition was disposed of after referring to the statements of Leela Devi (mother of petitioner No.1), Amrit Lal (father of petitioner No.1) and Malkit

Singh (uncle of petitioner No.1), but still they feel reasonable apprehension in their mind in respect of their civil rights and personal liberties at the hands of private respondents.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents, petitioners have prayed for necessary directions for safeguarding their personal civil and legal rights. In the aforesaid context, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 28.04.2017 (Annexure P7) to Superintendent of Police, Rural Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Addl, AG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No.1 to 3.

Without commenting upon validity of marriage, at this stage, respondent No.2 can be obligated to look into the grievance of the petitioners, which was espoused before him vide representation dated 28.04.2017 and pass appropriate order in accordance with law. Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his/her own mechanism to ascertain the truth. He/she would also be at liberty to join the petitioners or any other person acquainted with facts in issue. In case respondent No.2 finds that there is some truth in the allegations of the petitioners, then he/she shall proceed to take appropriate action

in accordance with law.

The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without meaning anything on the merits of the case. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any observation made by the Court in terms of pleadings at this stage. This order shall not debar the official respondents from proceeding against any of the party in accordance with law in case they are involved in some other case. It would be appreciated if the representation filed by the petitioners is decided within a period of one month from today keeping in view the threat perception shown by the petitioners.

Petition stands disposed of.

May 03, 2017

prince.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
---------------------------	--------

Whether reportable	Yes/No
--------------------	--------