

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

111

CRWP-10198-2020
Date of decision: 10.12.2020

Sonia Rani and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Jaspal Singh Pannu, Advocate for the petitioners
with petitioners in person.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

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

The petitioners, claiming themselves to be aged about 25 and 27 years respectively, have approached this Court seeking protection of their life and liberty on the averments that the petitioners, being major, performed marriage on 02.12.2020 at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Dasween (Regd.), Village Singha Devi, Tehsil Kharar, District Mohali, as per Sikh rites and ceremonies against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 6 and the petitioners are apprehending threat to their life and liberty at their instance.

Notice of motion restricted to respondents No.1 to 3 only.

Pursuant to supply of advance copy, Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

At this stage, Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.4 to 6 and he undertakes to file his power of attorney in the registry.

Respondents No.4 to 6 have also appeared in person before this Court through video conferencing.

The petitioners, who are present through video conferencing, have on being questioned by the Court admitted having solemnized marriage and reiterated their prayer for protection as mentioned in the petition.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners states that a representation dated 02.12.2020 (Annexure P-4) was made to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala seeking necessary protection but no action has been taken so far in the matter and prays for issuance of direction in this regard.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that in the copy of the above-said representation attached with the petition inadvertently due to typographical mistake name of District has been wrongly typed as Gurdaspur instead of Patiala which may be allowed to be corrected.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, the request is allowed and name of district is ordered to be corrected as Patiala instead of Gurdaspur and Registry is directed to make the necessary correction.

Learned Counsel for respondents No.4 to 6 submits that there is no threat to life and liberty of the petitioners from the side of respondents No.4 to 6.

Learned Counsel for respondents No.4 to 6 further submits that respondent No.4 wants to meet petitioner No.1 or talk to her and petitioner No.1 may be directed to allow him to meet or talk to her.

On being asked, petitioner No.1 has stated that she does not want to meet or talk to respondent No.4 as she apprehends danger to her life and liberty from him.

Learned State Counsel has no objection if appropriate direction for providing requisite protection to the petitioners is given.

Without examining the question of legality and validity of the marriage and expressing any opinion thereon, the petition is disposed of with the directions to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to look into the grievances of the petitioners as set out in the petition and also expressed in the representation (Annexure P-4) and take appropriate action for protection of their life and liberty as may be warranted by the circumstances.

For this purpose it is clarified that the petitioners shall not be called to the police station and in case it is considered to be necessary the police officials shall visit the place of their residence.

It is further clarified that in case any criminal case has been/is registered against petitioner No.2, then nothing in this order shall be construed as a bar for taking of appropriate action by the police authorities against him in respect thereof in accordance with law.

Registry is directed to send a copy of this order along with copy of the petition and above-said representation to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala for requisite compliance.

10.12.2020

Kothiwal

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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