

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA,
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No. 125 of 2017

Date of Decision: 03.02.2017

Rakesh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. D.P.S. Bajwa, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Ashwani Kumar Antil, Advocate,
for respondents no. 4 and 5.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

In this petition, it has been alleged by the petitioner that he solemnized his marriage with one Arti, daughter of respondents no. 4 and 5 on 19.12.2016, with the free consent of the said Arti and after their marriage they had also filed CRM-M-46576-2016, seeking protection of life and liberty on account of the fact that the aforesaid respondents were opposed to the marriage.

This Court in that petition, had granted interim protection to the petitioners at the time of issuance of notice, vide order dated 09.01.2017.

In the present petition, it has been further contended that on 12.01.2017, the aforesaid respondents convened a Panchayat and had stated that they want to take their daughter and would solemnize her marriage with the petitioner as per proper ceremony and rites.

However, thereafter, they refused to let the petitioner even

communicate with Arti and, allegedly, kept her in illegal detention against her

wishes.

Notice had been issued in this petition on 31.01.2017, with the Superintendent of Police, Sonapat, directed to ensure that the life and liberty of the alleged detainee was duly protected and that she was produced in Court today, escorted by lady police officials and adequate police staff. Respondents no. 4 and 5 had also been directed to be served of the notice issued, through the SHO, Police Station Sadar, Sonipat.

Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the girl, i.e. Arti, has been produced in Court today under escort and respondent no. 4 is also present in Court.

The petitioner is also present in Court.

Both the petitioner and the girls' father, i.e. respondent no. 4, having been told to go out of the Court, this Court has specifically put a query to the alleged detainee, i.e. Arti, as to whether she wants to reside with her parents or with the petitioner. She has very categorically stated in no uncertain terms, that she does want to go back with the petitioner and would like to continue residing with her parents. The query has been put her twice by this Court, to which he has replied as above.

In the aforesaid circumstances, this petition is dismissed with the aforesaid girl, Aarti, to be duly taken back under escort with her parents to her parental home.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 03, 2017
nitin

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes