

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

**CRM-M-34766-2017
Date of decision : 18.09.2017**

Preeti and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present : Petitioners with Mr. S.K. Virk, Advocate.

H.S. MADAAN, J. (Oral)

It is contended that petitioner No.1-Preeti aged more than 18 years has got married with petitioner No.2 Sodhi Ram aged about 29 years of her own against the wishes of her relatives and family members arrayed as respondents No.4 to 8, who are threatening to interfere in marital life of the petitioners, for redressal of that grievance, the petitioners have approached this Court.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Malvika Singh, AAG, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3-State. A complete set of the petition has been supplied to the State counsel. Whereas Sh. Subhash Kumar, Advocate has appeared for respondents No.4 to 8 by filing power of attorney, which is taken on record.

As a matter of fact Ms. Nirmal Kaur-respondent No.5, Balishawar Kumar- respondent No.6 and Sunil Kumar- respondent No.7 have appeared in person also. Learned counsel for the private respondents

has contended that antecedents of petitioner No.2 Sodhi Ram are shady inasmuch as he has got a criminal record, this fact is controverted by learned counsel for the petitioners. However, during these proceedings such type of assertions are not much material.

At the asking of Nirmal Kaur-respondent No.5, she has been allowed to meet petitioner No.1-Preeti in the Court.

Learned counsel representing private respondents states that though such respondents do not approve the marriage of the petitioners and they have neither interfered with marital life of the petitioners nor would they do so.

The petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to look into the representation (**Annexure P-4**) submitted by the petitioners and to provide requisite security to the petitioners, if the circumstances so require. However, this direction will not validate the marriage said to have taken place between the petitioners and will have no effect on any civil or criminal action which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

18.09.2017

Gaurav Sorot

**(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE**

1. Whether reportable? **No**
2. Whether speaking / reasoned? **Yes**