

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-396-2021

Date of Decision: 14.01.2021

Parmjeet Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present : Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Through Video Conferencing

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, with a prayer for issuance of a writ directing respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of respondents No.4 to 11 and not to harass her.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is of 18 years and 3 months and is major. There is an active threat from the parents of the petitioner that they will marry the petitioner to some old person whereas, she does not want to marry with such kind of person and that she in fact intends to marry to another boy namely, Vikas son of Ashok Kumar, resident of village Gulahar, Tehsil Patran. However, he is not of a marriageable age, therefore, at this point of time, she cannot marry with him. He has further submitted that it is a case where her parents are forcing her to marry her against her choice, whereas, she being major is entitled to marry according to her own choice. He has further submitted that the petitioner has given representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala as well as to

the Station House Officer, Police Station Patran, vide Annexures P-2 and P-3, respectively but no action has been taken in this regard.

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1, 2 and 3 only.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and states that he has no objection in case directions are given, at this stage, to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, to look into the representation, which has been made by the petitioner and to proceed in accordance with law.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, I am satisfied that there is no need to call for reply from the State because the only directions which are sought to be made in the present case are only with regard to protection of life of the petitioner.

Therefore, considering the totality and circumstances of the present case, it is directed that respondent No.2 shall look into the representation (Annexure P-2) filed by the petitioner and assess the threat perception of the petitioner and thereafter, in case, it is so required then to take appropriate measures as required in accordance with law within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of true copy of the present order.

Consequently, the present petition is disposed of.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

14.01.2021
adhikari

Whether speaking/non-speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No