

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

105

CRWP No. 9945 of 2020

Date of Decision:01.12. 2020

SUMAN LATA AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Vs

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Kuldeep Singh, 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 necessary directions to the official respondents for protecting their civil/personal rights and liberties from being invaded by the private respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the very outset, submits that the date of marriage between the petitioners could not be pleaded, but the petitioners have mentioned the date of marriage as 25.11.2020 in the representation filed before Superintendent of Police, Karnal/ respondent No.2. The representation dated 25.11.2020 is stated to have been sent through registered post.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr.Anant Kataria, D.A.G.,

Haryana accepts notice on behalf of State.

At this stage, without meaning anything in the context of validity of marriage and majority of the petitioners, it would be just and appropriate to direct respondent No.2 to look into the representation (if any) filed by the petitioners and pass an appropriate order on merits in accordance with law. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any pleadings made in the petition.

This order shall not debar the official respondents from proceeding against any of the parties, if they are involved in any other case. It would be appreciated if the needful is done within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

December 01, 2020

anita

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No