

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No.1612 of 2020

Date of Decision: 13.02.2020

Manjit 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. Manoj K.Sharma, Advocate.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

By way of filing present petition, the petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by respondents No.4 to 9.

Petitioners have contracted inter-religious marriage on 11.2.2020 according to Christian rites and ceremonies.

Mr. Sandeep K. Katik, Advocate appears on behalf of respondents No.4 to 9.

On the request of learned counsel for the private respondents, petitioner No.1 was allowed to interact with her mother for about half an hour in the Court itself.

Learned counsel for the private respondents states

that the anxiety of the parents of petitioner No.1 is only to see her welfare.

On a pointed query, learned counsel for the petitioners states that petitioner No.2 is having bank balance of about Rs.50,000/- and he is ready to create Fixed Deposit of that amount in the name of petitioner No.1 for a period of five years.

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.

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 12.02.2020 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 13, 2020

anita

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No