

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-1712-2017

Date of decision : 23.03.2017

Kanika Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. K.S. Pannu, DAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Though learned counsel for the petitioners is not present, reply by way of an affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Nabha, District Patiala, has been filed in Court today by learned State counsel, with which an affidavit stated to have been executed by petitioner no.1 has been annexed, to the effect that the petitioners no longer require any protection in Punjab, but apprehending a threat in Shimla, they would file a separate petition for protection before the competent Court there.

In view of the above, this petition is rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such with a direction to respondents no.2 to 3 to continue to ensure that the petitioners are given due protection within the State of Punjab in accordance with law.

It is made clear that if any proceedings are initiated under the provisions of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, by a competent person against the petitioners, on account of petitioner no.2 being below the

legally marriageable age of 21 years, this order would not be taken to be a bar on such proceedings.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

March 23, 2017.
Davinder Kumar

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