

210

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

* * *

CRWP No. 2007 of 2021

Decided on: 17th March, 2021

Rajni Devi and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Chetan Kapoor, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Kirpal Singh Thakur, AAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The matter is taken up for hearing through video conference due to COVID-19 situation.

This petition was filed for issuance of directions to the official respondents No.1 to 3 for protection of life and liberty of the petitioners from the private respondents No.4 to 8 arrayed in the petition.

As per the pleadings the petitioners had performed marriage against the wishes of their parents and there was a threat perception.

On 26th February, 2021, the following order was passed:-

“This is a petition seeking direction to the official respondents to protect life and liberty of the petitioners, as they have solemnised the marriage

against the wishes of parents of petitioner No. 1.

Notice of motion to the respondents No.1 to 3 only at this stage for 17.3.2021.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, DAG, Haryana appearing on advance notice accepts the same. He submits that at the time of solemnising the marriage, petitioner No. 2 was not of marriageable age, rather in the heading of petition his age has been wrongly mentioned as 21 years. He further submits that the matter would be looked into from that prospect that petitioner No. 2 was not of marriageable age.

Be that as it may, in the meantime the police officials not below the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police should record the statements of the petitioners.

In case a request is made by the petitioners, they may be provided shelter in safe house till the next date.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Karambir Singh submits that the statements of the petitioners, brother and father of the petitioner No. 1 have been recorded. It is stated therein that there is no threat perception to the petitioners and they do not need any police protection.

In view of above, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that no cause of action survives for pursuing the present petition.

The petition is disposed of as infructuous.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

17th March, 2021

pankaj baweja

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