

109

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

CRWP No.660 of 2020

Date of Decision: 21.01.2020

Baljeet Kaur and another

.....Petitioners

Vs

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Petitioners in-person along with
Mr. Amit Wadhwa, Advocate.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners states that the factum of second marriage of petitioner No.2 was not known to him at the time of filing the present petition. In fact, petitioner No.2 was earlier married to Amritpal Kaur. She started residing separately. Petitioner No.2 and said Amritpal Kaur decided to part ways. Thereafter, Amritpal Kaur has solemnized her second marriage. Out of new marriage, she is having two children.

Petitioners have preferred the present petition in the context of their alleged marriage on 17.01.2020. They feel reasonable apprehension qua their lives and liberties being

threatened at the instance of private respondents. Marriage certificate (Annexure P-3) and photographs of marriage (Annexure P-4) are sought to be pressed into service in order to project validity of marriage.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents, petitioners have prayed for necessary directions for safeguarding their personal civil and legal rights.

In the aforesaid context, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 17.01.2020 (Annexure P-5) to Senior Superintendent of Police (Rural), District Ludhiana.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Ghumman, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No.1 to 3.

At this juncture, this Court is not in a position to comment upon the validity of marriage and majority of the petitioners in terms of their respective ages, however, respondent No.2 can be asked to have a fair look on the grievance of the petitioners in order to ascertain veracity of allegations made by the petitioners.

Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his/her own mechanism to ascertain the truth. He/she would also be at liberty to join the petitioners or any other person acquainted with facts in issue. In case respondent No.2 finds that there is some

truth in the allegations of the petitioners, then he/she shall proceed to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without meaning anything on the merits of the case. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any observation made by the Court in terms of pleadings at this stage. This order shall not debar the official respondents from proceeding against any of the party in accordance with law in case they are involved in some other case. It would be appreciated if the representation filed by the petitioners is decided within a period of one month from today keeping in view the threat perception shown by the petitioners.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

21.01.2020

Prince

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No