

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

118

CRWP-8264-2020

Date of decision : 12.10.2020.

Mehak and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Harlove Singh Rajput, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate for respondents No.4 & 5.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioners are seeking a direction to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty, as they apprehend danger from respondents no. 4 and 5.

It is stated in the petition that the petitioners have performed their marriage, which is against the will of private respondents and they have apprehension that the private respondents might cause physical harm to them.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn my attention to the representation dated 07.10.2020 (Annexure P-6) sent by the petitioners to respondent no.2 -Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana.

Issue notice to the respondents.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3.

Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.4 and 5, who are the parents of petitioner No.1. He contends that respondents No.4 and 5 may be permitted to meet petitioner No.1.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that petitioner No.1 is also willing to meet respondents No.4 and 5.

Keeping in view the mandate of Supreme Court in the case of **“Lata Singh Vs. State of U.P. and another”, JT 2006 (6) SC 173**, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2–Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, to look into the matter and take appropriate action in accordance with law to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.

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

Petitioner No.1 shall meet respondents No.4 and 5 at the place and time to be fixed by respondent No.2.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

October 12, 2020
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No