

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(107)

CRWP No. 4474 of 2020

Date of Decision : 07.07.2020

Teena and another

....Petitioners

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Kanwar Pahul Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Manu Khan, Advocate for
Mr. Hardial Singh Baath, Advocate for the private respondents.

(presence marked through video conference)

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

The petition has been taken for hearing through video conference due to Covid-19 pandemic.

The petitioners are seeking a direction from this Court to respondents No. 2 to 4 to protect their life and liberty as they apprehend danger to their life & liberty from respondents Nos. 5 to 11 i.e. parents/relatives of the petitioner No.1, who are against the marriage solemnized by the petitioners. Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that it is most likely that the private respondents might cause physical harm to the petitioners as they have solemnized the marriage against the wishes of

respondent Nos. 5 to 11.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further argues that both the petitioners are major and have solemnized marriage according to Hindu Rites on 01.07.2020 and therefore, they want to live their independent life without any interference from the parents/relatives of petitioner No.1 i.e. respondent Nos. 5 to 11. Learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn attention of this Court to the representation dated 01.07.2020 (Annexure P-4) made by the petitioners to respondent No.2-Commissioner of Police, Amritsar seeking protection to their life and liberty.

Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 4 only.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who has joined the proceedings through video conference, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of State of Punjab-respondent Nos.1 to 4.

Learned counsel for the private respondents, who also appears through video conference, states that petitioner No. 2 is already married, which fact is denied by the learned counsel for petitioner No. 2, after obtaining instructions from her in this regard. Learned counsel for the private respondents states that private respondents are law abiding citizen and will not act in a manner, which cause danger to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

Without making any observation on the merits of the case, especially in respect of the validity of marriage performed by the petitioners, a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to take appropriate decision on the representation, which the petitioners alleged to have made on 01.07.2020 (Annexure P-4), expressing apprehension about danger to

their life and liberty at the hands of respondents Nos. 5 to 11 within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the copy of this order. In case any merit is found in the representation, the appropriate action will be taken by respondent No.2 to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of the private respondents.

It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as an approval of this Court about the marriage of the petitioners and no opinion with regard to the validity of the marriage has been expressed in this order.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

July 07, 2020
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether reasoned/speaking?</i>	✓ <i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	✓ <i>Yes/No</i>