

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

116

CRWP No.9655 of 2020

Date of Decision:23.11.2020

AMRIK SINGH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr.Daman Jeet Bhoriwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

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

Petitioners have prayed for issuance of appropriate directions to respondent No.2 for protection of their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by respondent Nos. 4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that Karanjit Singh, son of petitioner No.1 has performed marriage with Amrita, daughter of respondent No.4 on 04.11.2020. They have performed the marriage by running away from their respective houses and against the wishes of their parents. Petitioner No.1 is father of Karanjit Singh. Petitioner No.2 is Taya of Karanjit Singh. Petitioner No.3 is sister of Karanjit Singh and petitioner No.4 is uncle of Karanjit Singh. The couple has

already preferred a petition for protection before the Court of Sessions at Amritsar. Vide order dated 04.11.2020, the Court has passed the order directing respondents No.1 and 2 therein to protect the lives and liberties of the couple.

The grievance of the petitioners is that the whereabouts of Karanjit Singh and Amrita are not known to them, but the private respondents No.4 to 7, with the help of respondent No.3, are raiding the houses of the petitioners to know the whereabouts of Karanjit Singh and Amrita. They have given threats of dire consequences to the petitioners.

For the grievance in question, the petitioners have already moved a representation before the Senior Superintendent of Police (Rural), Amritsar- respondent No.2 on 16.11.2020 (Annexure P-2), but no action has been taken on the same so far.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. R.S.Thind, DAG, Punjab Accepts notice on behalf of the State.

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

In view of above, without meaning anything on the

merits of the case, this petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.2 to have a fair look on the representation filed by the petitioners and decide the same in accordance with law without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded herein above. It would be appreciated if the representation filed by the petitioners is decided within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

November 23 , 2020

anita

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No