

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-17215-2017

Date of Decision: 02.06.2017

Karampal Jeet Kaur and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajesh Mehta, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Amandeep S. Gill, A.P.P., U.T., Chandigarh.

Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, Advocate,
for respondent no. 4.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By this petition, the petitioners seek protection of life and liberty, allegedly being under threat from respondents no. 4 to 7, on account of the fact that they are stated to have married each other against the wishes of said respondents.

Notice had been issued in this petition on 15.05.2017, observing therein the age of the petitioners as submitted to this Court, petitioner no. 1 being about 18 years of age and petitioner no. 2, being about 30 years of age.

It had specifically been stated that no comment was being made on the validity of the marriage, but protection of life and liberty obviously being a fundamental right, it was to be ensured by respondents no. 2 and 3 that the petitioners are protected against any harm or threat at the hands of the aforesaid respondents.

and submits that pursuant to the aforesaid order, the petitioners were duly taken to the S.H.O. Police Station Ise Khan by the police of Police Station Sector 3, Chandigarh.

It is seen that as per the report of the Registry, though no process fee was filed by counsel for the petitioner and even today he is not present in court, however, the order of this Court dated 15.05.2017, is stated to have been received by respondent no. 3, i.e. the SHO, Police Station Kot Ise Khan, District Moga, and pursuant to that, Sub Inspector Baldev Singh, is present in Court and learned State counsel on his instructions submits that petitioner no. 2 has been earlier also married and has three children.

The statement of the first wife (as contended) of petitioner no. 2, has been recorded by the police, i.e. of Baljit Kaur.

Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, Advocate, appears for respondents no. 4 and 5, i.e. the step father of petitioner no. 1 and the mother of the said petitioner. He has filed his power of attorney today in Court, which is taken on record.

He also reiterates what has been stated by learned State counsel and points to a lady present in Court along with three children, stating that they are actually the wife and children of petitioner no. 2.

Consequently, this petition is dismissed, with a direction that all proceedings against the petitioners, would continue, as per law and be taken to their logical conclusion, with the petitioners, naturally, at liberty to take all pleas as are legally available to them in their defence.

June 02, 2017
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No.