

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

224

**CRWP-1904-2020
Decided on : 16.09.2021**

Muskan Bano @ Archana Patel and another

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL
(Through Video Conferencing)**

PRESENT: Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

The present Criminal Writ Petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of appropriate writ, order or direction especially issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

On 19.02.2020, a Coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following orders:-

“It is contended that the petitioner No.1 Muskan Bano @ Archana Patel, aged about 26 years had got married with petitioner No.2 Intaj Ali, aged about 29 years against wishes of her family members, who are arrayed as private respondents No.4 to 7 and such respondents are threatening to assault them.

Notice of motion for 15.04.2020.

In the meanwhile, respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala is directed to ensure that no physical harm is caused to the petitioners at hands of private respondents or persons claiming under them. However, this order shall not validate the marriage between the petitioners and shall not protect them from any civil or criminal action, to which they may be found liable.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that at present, there is no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioners and thus, the present petition has become infructuous.

Keeping in view the above said facts and the statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the present petition is disposed of, having been rendered infructuous.

However, liberty is granted to the petitioners to move a fresh representation before respondent No. 2- Senior Superintendent of Police in case of any apprehension in future and in case, such a representation is moved then, respondent No. 2 is directed to look into the matter and take appropriate action, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

16.09.2021

Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No