

CRWP-99-2021

Date of Decision:26.02.2021

Priksha Rana and another	Petitioners
Vs.	
State of Punjab and others	Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Harkeerat S. Sangotha, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sartaj Singh Gill, Advocate,
for respondents no. 4 and 5.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Case heard by video conference.

By this petition, the petitioners seek protection of life and liberty at the hands of respondents no.4 and 5, upon the petitioners having married each other (as contended) against the wishes of the said respondents, on 03.01.2021.

At the initial stage on 07.01.2021, the following order had been passed by this court:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that both the petitioners have married with each other vide Annexure P-3 and the parents of both the petitioners are not consenting to their marriage and there is threat to their life and liberty, therefore, they pray for grant of protection to their life and liberty.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Luvinder Sofat, Asst.AG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State-respondents No.1 to 3. At this stage, Mr. Sartaj Singh Gill, Advocate has caused appearance on behalf of respondents No.4 and 5 and submits that Annexure P-3 Marriage Certificate is a forged and fabricated certificate particularly in view of the fact that no witnesses are mentioned in the certificate and girl is already engaged with somebody else and she has been falsely taken away by petitioner No.2.

In view of the above, Senior Superintendent of Police, Rupnagar is directed to depute a lady police officer in this

regard to inquire about the aforesaid contentions raised by learned counsel for respondent Nos. 4 and 5 and thereafter, to file state report before this Court.

Needless to say that in the meantime, if there is a need to grant protection to the life and liberty of the petitioners then the same may be done in accordance with law.

Adjourned to 19.01.2021.

Let Status Report be filed before the next date of hearing.”

Thereafter, a status by way of an affidavit of the DSP, Sri Anandpur Sahib, has been filed, from paragraph 4 of which learned State counsel points out again (as he had done on the last date of hearing), that upon the petitioners as also respondents no.4 and 5 having been visited by the police, they stated that they no longer need protection and are residing happily together as husband and wife.

Consequently, on 16.02.2021, the following order had been passed by this court:-

“Case heard by video conference.

Though a reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent State, counsel for the petitioners has sought an adjournment through the co-ordinator of this video conference.

Learned State counsel submits, on the basis of the said reply, that in fact the petitioners themselves have stated before the police that they no longer require any protection.

Adjourned to 26.02.2021.

To be shown in the urgent motion list.”

Today in the pre-lunch session learned counsel for the petitioners, who had not appeared even on the last date of hearing, had wished to inform this court through the co-ordinator of this video conference that he would be seeking an adjournment as he was out of station.

When this court had not been inclined to adjourn the matter in view of the affidavit of the DSP and with learned counsel for respondents no.4 and 5, i.e. the parents of petitioner no.1, also submitting that they have reconciled to the marriage of the petitioners with each other and with

petitioner no.1 being above 18 years of age they have no issue with the marriage at all, the matter had been kept pending till the post lunch session with the co-ordinator of the video conference having been asked to inform counsel for the petitioners that the matter would not be adjourned and therefore he may connect to the video conference even by his mobile phone from wherever he wants.

Thereafter, the co-ordinator the video conference tells me that he did in fact join the meeting at one point (when I was hearing the previous case), but again now he is not contactable.

In any case with the aforesaid statement of the DSP corroborated by learned counsel for respondent no.4 and 5, I see no reason to continue with this petition, which is consequently disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

However, if the petitioners apprehend any threat to the life and liberty at any stage hereinafter, they would naturally be free to approach the police authorities concerned, who would thereafter extend them due protection as per law.

February 26, 2021

dharamvir/

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO
Whether Reportable : YES/NO