

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

CRM-M-24465 of 2016 (O&M)
Decided on:-September 14th, 2018.

SAVITA RANI AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners.

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Swati, Advocate
for Mr. J.S. Saneta, Advocate
for respondents No. 4, 5 and 8.

~*~

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for issuance of directions to the respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 8 as the petitioners have married against their wishes.

Reply on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3 by way of an affidavit by Vivek Chaudhary, HPS Deputy Superintendent of Police, City, Karnal has

already been filed. The reply is accompanied with the statements of respondents No. 4 to 8 namely Raj Kumar, Mohinder Singh, Ishwar, Ramesh and Pawan respectively. State counsel has drawn attention of this Court to paragraph-3 of the reply which reads as under:-

“That the Enquiry Officer also visited the house of the private respondents namely Raj Kumar, Mohinder, Ishwar, Ramesh and Pawan all residents of Village Raipur Roran, Karnal District Karnal, who have been categorically stated that the petitioners have solemnized marriage with their own consent and they have no objection qua the marriage of the petitioners. They further submitted that they have no relation with Savita and her husband, now where ever they wants to live, they have no objection for the same. The copy of statement of Raj Kumar, Mohinder Singh, Ishwar, Ramesh and Pawan are attached herewith Anneuxre R-II, R-III, R-IV, R-V & R-VI respectively for the kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court”

In view of the aforesaid reply so submitted by the State and the statements made by the respondents No. 4 to 8 this Court finds that this petition is rendered infructuous.

Moreover, no one has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioners. Even on the last date no one appears on their behalf. Thus the averments made in the reply goes un-rebutted.

Disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

However, in case petitioners still apprehend threat to their lives and liberty, they are all liberty to approach the SSP concerned.

September 14th 2018

tarun

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No