

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

109

**CRM-M-16030-2019 (O & M)
Date of Decision:09.04.2019**

KOMALDEEP KAUR AND ANR

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Bhupinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed by the petitioners under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of a direction to the official respondents No.1 to 3 for protection of their life and liberty at the hands of private respondents No.4 and 5, as they have married against the wishes of private respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the marriage was allegedly performed at Mata Mansa Devi Mandir, Panchkula. Though the representation submitted by the petitioners contains the alleged fact that marriage was solemnized at Panchkula. The photographs which are attached at Annexure P-3 do not appear to be of a temple but look like a part of the residence. Incidentally, these photographs are of the same place wherein another similarly situated couple has alleged the performance of marriage in the connected petition i.e. CRM-M-15826-2019 to describe the place as Sanatan Dharm Mandir. It is evident from the conflicting stands taken by the petitioners in the two different sets of petitions, describing the place of

marriage as different temples but apparently which is not at all a temple. The contents of the petition lack necessary particulars and do not inspire any confidence. The alleged marriage is also seriously doubtful.

In view of the above, no ground for invoking the inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is made out.

Dismissed.

09.04.2019

sheetal

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No