

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

123

**CRM No.M-12464 of 2019
Date of decision: 18.03.2019**

Gurlal Singh and anotherPetitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Prashant Vashisth, 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 12.03.2019 in Shree Ragunath Mandir (Regd.), near Railway Bridge, New Kundanpuri, Civil Lines, Ludhiana, as per Hindu rites against the wishes of parents of petitioner No.2, 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. Harsimar Singh Sitta, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3. 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.

The petitioners have placed on record representation dated

13.03.2019 (Annexure P-4) made to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana seeking necessary protection in which date of their marriage was mentioned as 23.07.2017 instead of 12.03.2019. Learned counsel for the petitioners has stated that the date of marriage in the representation (Annexure P-4) has been wrongly mentioned as 23.07.2017 instead of 12.03.2019 due to typographical mistake and that inadvertently no representation could be made to Senior Superintendent of Police, Mansa.

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, Mansa to look into the grievances of the petitioners expressed in the petition 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.

Registry is directed to send a copy of this order along with copy of petition to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Mansa, for requisite compliance.

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

18.03.2019

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No