

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CrI. Misc. No. M-10058 of 2018
Date of Decision: March 09, 2018

Krishma Sharma

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Nandan Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for directions to respondents No. 1 and 2 to protect her life and liberty at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is major and wants to marry one Rohit Madhok but the private respondents are forcibly preventing her from doing so and are issuing threats to her.

A representation dated 03.03.2018 (Annexure P-2) has also been submitted to respondent No. 3, but no action is being taken thereupon.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3. Let four copies of petition be supplied to him during the course of the day.

In view of the nature of order that is being passed there is no necessity to issue notice to private respondents No. 4 to 7 at this stage.

The petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No. 3 to consider representation dated 03.03.2018 (Annexure P-2) and take appropriate action in accordance with law, if found necessary within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

March 09, 2018

reena

**[SUDHIR MITTAL]
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No