

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

CRM-M No.4419 of 2017

Date of Decision: 09.03.2017

Rubal and anotherPetitioners
Versus

State of Haryana and others ... Respondents

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

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

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manoj Chahal, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Ms. Ashima Mor, AAP, UT, Chandigarh.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

On 09.02.2017, following order was passed by this Court:-

“In this petition, petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary directions to the official respondents to protect their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by the private respondent. Petitioners claimed themselves to be major and have contacted marriage according to their own sweet will, but against the wishes of their family members. Photographs and marriage certificate are sought to be pressed into service in order to project validity of marriage.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondent, petitioners have prayed for necessary directions for safeguarding their personal civil and legal rights. In the aforesaid context, petitioners have allegedly moved representation to Superintendent of Police,

Rohtak and SHO Police Station Kalanaur, Rohtak.

Notice of motion for 09.03.2017.

At this stage, Mr. Pradeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and Mr. Manoj Chahal, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.4.

At this juncture, it is found that petitioner No.2 has gone outside the Court.

Keeping in view the apprehension that large number of family members of the petitioners have come to the Court premises, therefore, it would be just and appropriate to direct the SHO, Police Station Sector-3, Chandigarh to provide safe passage to petitioner No.1 upto the Protection Home at Sector 19, Chandigarh and the whereabouts of petitioner No.2 be also ascertained and thereafter, he shall also be sent to the Protection Home. They be produced in this Court on the date fixed.

A copy of this order be given to the learned counsel for the petitioners under the signatures of Bench Secretary of this Court as per rules.”

Today petitioners have been produced by the police. Petitioner No.2 states that he also joined petitioner No.1 in the protection home at a subsequent stage.

Keeping in view the controversy involved in the present case, it would be just and appropriate to direct respondent No.2 to visualize the situation in the context of threat perception of the petitioners and take appropriate steps in accordance with law.

Petitioners would also be at liberty to file any other representation before respondent No.2 in relation to their civil rights. Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his own mechanism to ascertain the facts and thereafter, pass appropriate order in the context of protection of lives and liberties of the petitioners. SHO Police Station Sector-3, Chandigarh is directed to provide safe passage to the petitioners to protection home at Mansa Devi, Panchkula. Respondent No.3 is directed to provide necessary protection to the petitioners till representation filed by them not decided by respondent No.2.

Petition is disposed of accordingly.

A copy of this order be given to the learned State Counsel under the signatures of Bench Secretary of this Court as per rules.

09.03.2017
prince
Whether Reasoned/Speaking

Whether Reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No