

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

CRM-M No.19822 of 2017
Date of Decision: 30.05.2017

NISHAN SINGH

-PETITIONER

VS

STATE OF PUNJAB & OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to respondent No.2 to protect life and personal liberty of the petitioner from being infringed by respondents No.3 to 5.

Respondent No.5 abducted the daughter of the petitioner and thereafter, under the garb of solemnizing marriage on 17.04.2017, filed CRM-M No.13284 of 2017 titled **Sajan Singh and another vs State of Punjab and others**. The said petition was disposed of vide order dated 20.04.2017 by passing the following operative part of the order:-

*“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.”

In view of nature of controversy, the petitioner approached respondent No.3 to highlight the factum of minority of daughter of the petitioner and now, respondents No.3 to 5 are after the blood of the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Rimplejeet Kaur, A.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4.

At this stage, in view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of filing any reply to the petition as no order prejudicial to interest of any of the party is being passed.

This petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to have a fair look at the grievance of the petitioner in the light of order dated 20.04.2017 already passed in CRM-M No.13284 of 2017 and would consider the grievance of the petitioner by taking pragmatic approach to the facts and circumstances of the case in accordance with law.

30.05.2017

jjyoti Y.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No