

CRWP-5280-2020(O&M)

Date of decision: 27.07.2020

VAIL SINGH AND ANR.

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Aakash Juneja, Advocate
for the petitioners.

*(The case has been taken up through video conferencing on
account of Covid-19 Pandemic)*

VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)

At the very outset, it has been stated by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the word "Kurukshetra" has been wrongly mentioned against the name of respondent No.2 in the memo of parties. It appears to be typographical error and respondent No.2 shall be read as Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda.

It has been stated by the learned counsel for the petitioners that respondent No.4 is their daughter-in-law and respondent No.5 is her father. The marriage of the son of the petitioners was solemnized with respondent No.4 on 17.10.2016. The son of the petitioners is residing in New Zealand. The petitioners are apprehending danger to their lives and liberty at the instance of respondents No.4 and 5. They have already submitted a representation dated 24.06.2020 (Annexure P-1) to respondent No.2.

Notice of motion to official respondents only.

Mr. H.S. Sitta, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Copy of the paper-book be supplied to him during the course of

the day through email.

Without making any further observations with regard to the genuineness of the allegations, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to look into the grievance of the petitioners as projected through the representation dated 24.06.2020 (Annexure P-1) in accordance with law.

27.07.2020
renubala

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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