

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

**CRM NO. M-8482 OF 2017
DECIDED ON : 24.05.2017**

Amandeep Kaur and another

...Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : Mr. Dinesh Nagar, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajesh Mehta, Addl. AG, Punjab,
for respondents No.1 to 3.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

On the first date after notice was issued, the report of the Registry was to the effect that process fee had not been filed by the petitioners. Thereafter, upon process fee having been filed, the report of the registry is to the effect that respondents No.4 and 5 remain unserved as they were not found to be residing at the address given in the memo of parties and actually reside outside the country.

It is to be noticed that respondents No.1 to 3 already stood served as on the date that notice was issued.

Be that as it may, since the persons whom the petitioners apprehend a threat to their lives and liberty from, i.e. the parents of petitioner No. 1, not stated to be resident of India,

this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners is duly protected within the four corners of law.

However, if any of the averments made in this petition are found to be false, either with regard to the age of the petitioners, their previous marital status, or them being in any prohibited relationship to each other, or on any other count, this order shall not be taken to be a bar on proceedings initiated by a competent person, as per law.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

MAY 24, 2017
Shalini/Poonam-II

Whether speaking/reasoned :	YES/NO
Whether reasoned :	YES/NO