

CRWP-9204-2020

Date of decision: 06.11.2020

SAVITA RANI AND ANR.

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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

VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Nandakumar and another Versus State of Kerala and others**, AIR 2018 SC 2254 and judgment of this Court in **CWP No. 31834 of 2019 titled as Megha and another Versus State of Haryana and others**, decided on 04.11.2019.

It has been stated that both the petitioners have attained the age of valid marriage. The petitioners are presently in live in relationship and are contemplating to solemnize marriage in the near future. None of the petitioner was married at the earlier instance. They are apprehending danger to their lives and liberty at the instance of respondent Nos.4 to 8, who are the relatives of petitioner No.1.

Without dilating further, suffice it to say that the Court is primarily concerned with the petitioners' right to protect their lives and liberty against any perceived threat at the instance of third party as such right has been guaranteed to them as per Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

It has been pointed out that a representation dated 02.11.2020 (Annexure P-3) has already been submitted to respondent No.2.

Notice of motion to the official respondents.

Mr. Davinderbir Singh, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Copy of the paper-book be supplied to him during the course of the day through email.

Without making any further observations on the merits or legality and validity of the relationship, 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 02.11.2020 (Annexure P-3) in accordance with law and furthermore, take remedial action, if the apprehension of danger is real and genuine one.

This order is not to be construed as any opinion with regard to the legality and validity of the relationship, or the age of the petitioners or with regard to any civil or criminal proceedings.

06.11.2020
renubala

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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