

112

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

CRWP No.822 of 2020

Date of Decision: 27.01.2020

JASVIR 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. Paviterdeep Singh Bhinder, Advocate.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

In this petition, petitioners have approached this Court by way of the present writ petition for issuance of writ, order or directions especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by the private respondents No.4 to 6.

Petitioners have alleged that petitioner No.1 was married with one Varinder Singh on 05.05.2013. Out of the said wedlock, one son namely Prabhjot Singh took birth. He is studying and is in the custody of his grand-parents. Husband of

petitioner No.1 died on 14.08.2015. Petitioner No.2 was married with one Karamjeet Kaur and out of this wedlock, 2 children took birth who are aged 22 years and 17 years as on date. Both the children are living with petitioner No.2. Matrimonial life of petitioner No.2 and his wife could not go smoothly and both of them have decided to part-ways. Petitioner No.2 has pleaded dissolution of his marriage by way of oral panchayati divorce.

At this stage, they pray for protection of their lives and liberties only as they have decided to marry each other after taking legal divorce by petitioner No.2 from his wife.

In the aforesaid context, petitioners have statedly moved representation dated 20.01.2020 (Annexure P-3) to the Sr. Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala, District Kapurthala.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No.1 to 3.

At this juncture, this Court does not wish to comment upon the validity of relationship between the petitioners and also refrains from commenting upon any likely marriage between the parties, but for the protection of their lives and personal liberties, respondent No.2 can be obligated to consider the representation dated 20.01.2020 filed by the petitioners.

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.

January 27, 2020
geeta

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

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