

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

**CWP No. 17315 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:17.08.2019**

Vijay Kumar and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- None for the petitioners.

Ms. Ambika Sood, DAG Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA J.(Oral)

Petitioners filed the instant writ petition seeking a mandamus for directing the official respondents to take necessary steps for protection of their life and liberty by voicing an apprehension and threat to the same at the hands of private respondents No.4 and 7. Both the petitioners are stated to have attained the age of majority. It is averred that they have got married against the wishes of their family members and it is under such circumstances that they feel threatened.

On 28.06.2019, while issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court:-

It is stated that petitioner No.1 – Vijay Kumar, aged about 23 years and petitioner No.2 – Kamaljit Kaur aged about 21 years have got married against wishes of their family members, who are threatening to interfere in their marital life, as such to seek protection in that regard, they have approached this Court by way of filing the present petition.

Of course nobody can be allowed to take law into his hands and to indulge in illegal activities.

Notice of motion for 11.7.2019.

In the meanwhile, respondent No.2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Hoshiarpur is directed to ensure that no physical harm is caused to the petitioners at the hands of private respondents or persons claiming under them. However, this order is not to be taken as legalizing the alleged marriage between the petitioners and shall not save the petitioners from any criminal or civil action, to which they may be found liable in view of the circumstances of the case.

Learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Vasdev, PS Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur, apprises the Court that the statements of respondents No.4 and 7 have since been recorded and as per which they are not opposed to the matrimonial alliance.

Under such circumstances, the writ petition has been rendered infructuous. The factual position as has been put forth by learned State counsel would also perhaps explain the non-appearance of the counsel for the petitioners.

Writ petition is disposed of as infructuous.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

August 17, 2019

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No