

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

CRM No.M-33 of 2019

Date of decision: 02.01.2019

Satish Kumar Nirmal and anotherPetitioners

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh & othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Amandeep Singh Gulati, Advocate for the petitioners
with the petitioners in person.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

The petitioners have approached this Court seeking protection of their life and liberty on the averments that the petitioners, being major, performed marriage on 31.12.2018 at a Mandir Situated in Mansa Devi Complex, Panchkula, as per Hindu rites and rituals against the wishes of parents of petitioner No.1, impleaded as respondents No.4 and 5 and the petitioners are apprehending threat to their life and liberty at their instance.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Lalit K. Gupta, Advocate, Additional Public Prosecutor, U.T., Chandigarh, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Complete set of paper book has been supplied to learned State counsel.

The petitioners, who are major as per the documents including Aadhar Cards attached with the petition, are present in the Court and duly identified by their counsel. On being questioned by the Court, the petitioners have admitted having solemnized marriage and reiterated their prayer as mentioned in the petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that a representation dated 31.12.2018 (Annexure P-6) was made to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh, seeking necessary protection but no action has been taken so far in the matter.

Without examining the question of legality and validity of the marriage and expressing any opinion thereon, the petition is disposed of with the directions to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh, to look into the grievances of the petitioners expressed in the representation (Annexure P-6) and take appropriate action for protection of their life and liberty as may be warranted by the circumstances.

However, it is clarified that in case any criminal case has been/is registered against petitioner No.1, then nothing in this order shall be construed as a bar to taking of appropriate action by the police authorities against him in respect thereof in accordance with law.

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

02.01.2019

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No