

233

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

CRWP No.9647 of 2020(O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.12.2020

Veena and another

.....Petitioners

Vs

State of Harayna and others

.....Respondents

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

Present:Ms. Veenus Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Monika Jangra, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

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

Petitioners have preferred this petition for protection of their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by private respondents.

Perusal of the petition would show that there is concealment of the fact in respect of prior marital status of the petitioners. Both are found to be married earlier to the present marriage and have children from their earlier marriage.

Petitioners feel reasonable apprehension from private respondents.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of father of petitioner No.1 states that father of petitioner No.1 is ready to keep petitioner No.1 according to her wish.

Learned State counsel submits that present petition is not maintainable as disputed facts are involved.

Keeping in view the nature of allegations, I deem it appropriate not to comment upon marital status of the petitioners. At this stage, this Court is only concerned about lives of the petitioners who are stated to be under threat. Petitioners, if so, advised may approach respondent No.2 by way of filing their representation. In the event of filing such representation, respondent No.2 shall act in accordance with law and if need arises, grant lawful protection to the petitioners.

Disposed of.

December 01, 2020

Prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No