

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

**114**

**CRM-M No.32207 of 2020  
Date of decision:12.10.2020**

**LEEMA AND ANOTHER**

**.....Petitioners**

**Vs**

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr.Manoj K.Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)**

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

This petition has been filed for issuance of appropriate directions to respondent No.4 to conclude enquiry arising out of FIR No. 174 dated 18.8.2020 under Section 366-A IPC and offence under Section 376 IPC (added later on) registered at police Station Mahilpur District Hoshiarpur.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioner No.1 is not arrayed as accused in the aforesaid FIR, rather her family members have been involved. Son of the petitioners contracted marriage with one Kuhgi. Kuhgi and son of the petitioners are major. Earlier Kuhgi was proposed to be engaged with son of the complainant, but she did not like him and contracted runaway marriage with son of the

petitioners. Thereafter, the couple filed CRWP No. 7108 of 2020 in the High Court in which order dated 11.9.2020 was passed, deciding the writ petition with a direction to Senior Superintendent of Police, Hoshiarpur to take appropriate action as warranted in accordance with law upon the representation dated 9.9.2020 filed by the petitioners therein and to extend adequate protection to their lives and liberties, if necessary. The only grievance of the petitioners, at this stage, is that though they have not been arrayed as accused in the FIR, but owing to the relationship of their son with Kuhgi, the police at the instance of respondent No.6 is harassing the petitioners.

Precisely, for the grievance in question, petitioners have moved a representation dated 17.9.2020 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.3.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr.Harbir Sandhu, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 5.

In view of nature of order, which this Court proposes to pass there is no necessity of calling upon any response at this stage, as no order prejudicial to the interest of respondents is being passed.

In view of above, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, respondent No.3 is directed to decide the representation dated 17.9.2020 (Annexure P-4) filed by the

petitioners in accordance with law within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

**October 12, 2020**

anita

**Whether reasoned/speaking**

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)  
JUDGE**

**Yes/No**