

130

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

CRWP No.1539 of 2020

Date of Decision: 11.02.2020

Anjali 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. J.S. Thakur, Advocate.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

By way of filing present petition, the petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by respondents No.4 and 5.

Mr. Sandeep K. Katik, Advocate appears on behalf of respondents No.4 and 5.

At the very outset, learned counsel for respondents No.4 and 5 submits that respondent No.4 be allowed to talk with petitioner No.1. He further submits that the parents of petitioner No.1 are only concerned about the welfare of petitioner No.1.

Respondent No.4 has been allowed to interact with petitioner No.1 in the Court itself for about ten minutes.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner No.2 is running a chicken corner in Sangrur and he is ready to creat fixed deposit in the name of petitioner No.1 so as to ward off any such apprehension of the parents of petitioner No.1.

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.

In view of nature of controversy involved herein, this Court refrains from commenting upon validity of marriage. Petitioners would be at liberty to approach respondent No.2 in the context of their threat perception and press their representation dated 08.02.2020 which has been allegedly sent to respondent No.2.

Petitioner No.2 after executing fixed deposit in a sum of Rs.5 lacs in favour of petitioner No.1 for a period of five years at the first instance, shall approach respondent No.2. In such eventuality if, the petitioners appear before respondent No.2 and press their representation, then respondent No.2 would hear the grievance of 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.

February 11, 2020

Prince

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

Whether speaking/reasoned

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No

Yes/No