

CRWP No. 542 of 2021
Date of Decision: 23.02.2021

Gurpreet Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sidakmeet Sandhu, A.A.G, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

On 05.02.2021, the following order had been passed:-

*“On 19.01.2021, the following order had been passed:-**“Case heard by video conferencing.**Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioners are seeking protection of life and liberty at the hands of respondent no.4, who is stated to be the brother of petitioner no.2, on account of the fact that he is (as alleged) trying to force petitioner no.2 to get married to someone whom she does not wish to marry.**Upon pointing out to the learned counsel for the petitioners that the present petition is shown to be filed by petitioner no.2 through her father, without his name, he submits that it was an inadvertent mistake.**Be that as it may, notice of motion is issued, with Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, learned DAG, Punjab, accepting notice on behalf of respondents no.1 to 3, on the asking of the court.*

A copy of the petition be e-mailed to him today itself by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

Adjourned to 05.02.2021.

Respondent no.4 be served by way of normal process.

Since petitioner no.2 is not of the age of majority, with Mr. Puri in fact submitting that petitioner no.2 is also not feeling safe in the house of her father (though he is not entirely against her as is his son, but under influence of his son, he too is not doing anything to protect the said petitioner).

That being so, though the custody of an unmarried minor girl (below the age of 18 years), would normally be with her father, but as she is apprehending a threat to her life and liberty in the house of her father, the petitioners are directed to appear before the SSP, Sangrur, immediately; and upon doing so, petitioner no.2 shall be escorted and got admitted to the Gandhi Vanita Aashram, Jalandhar, or any other suitable and safe place where her life and liberty shall be duly protected at the hands of respondent no.4 and any other person, with the life and liberty of petitioner no.1 also to be duly protected.

The SSP, Sangrur, is directed to get an affidavit of a gazetted officer filed to the petition, also stating therein as to whether the aforesaid order has been complied with or not.

If the affidavit is not filed by the next date of hearing, the SSP, Sangrur, shall be present in court by way of video conferencing.”

Today a status report by way of an affidavit of the DSP, SubDivision, Malerkotla, is on record, stating therein that petitioner no.2 has been ‘admitted’ to the Gandhi Vanita Aashram, Jalandhar, with respondent no.4 and his family also having submitted

that if she gets married upon attaining majority to petitioner no.1, they would have no objection to the said marriage.

However, as counsel for the petitioners has sought an adjournment through the coordinator of the video conference, the matter is adjourned to 23.02.2021.

As per the report of the Registry, notice issued to respondent no.4 stands served; however, none appears for him today.”

Today, learned counsel appears for the petitioner and submits that the matter having been settled between the parties, the petitioners immediate grievance has been redressed, and consequently they are under no threat from the said respondents.

In view of the aforesaid statement made, this petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous, with of course the life and liberty of the petitioners to be continued to be protected in case of any apprehension or threat, with no observation made at all by this court as regards the 'merits of the case'.

February 23, 2021

nitin

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)

JUDGE

Yes
No.