

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No.M-9444 of 2017

Date of Decision: March 24, 2017

Sukhdeep Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. L.S. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioners.
Mr. Rajesh Mehta, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

It is seen that what was missed by this Court on the last date of hearing, is that the first two pages of the petition are in fact missing, which the Registry also, wonderfully, did not even bother to check.

Be that as it may, learned State counsel submits that pursuant to the order dated 20.03.2017, it has been determined from the Nambardar of Village Sangowal, District Jalandhar, i.e. the village which petitioner no.2 is shown to be belonging to, that the said petitioners' first wife had actually died.

As regards respondents no.4 to 6, of whom respondent no.4 is stated to be father of petitioner no.1, his statement has been recorded.

As per the said statement, learned State counsel, on instructions from the police official who is present in Court to assist him, submits that petitioner no.1 is above 19 years of age and that the said respondents do not have any objection of her marriage to petitioner no.2.

Keeping in view the above, the petition is disposed of as having

been rendered infructuous, but still without any comment made on the validity of the marriage of the petitioners, there being no firm proof with regard to the earlier marital status of petitioner no.2.

However, protection of life and liberty being a fundamental right, such life and liberty of the petitioners would continue to be protected by respondents no.2 and 3, within the four corners of law.

March 24, 2017
vcgarg

(Amol Rattan Singh)
Judge

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: no