

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

111

CRWP-2440-2020

Date of Decision: 16.09.2021

Tinkle Kumari and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : Ms. Pooja Khosla, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

By this petition, the petitioners seek protection of life and liberty at the hands of respondents no.4 to 6, upon the petitioners having married each other (as contended) against the wishes of the said respondents, on 03.03.2020.

Learned counsel appearing for counsel for the petitioners on the last date of hearing having stated that the petitioners no longer wish to pursue this petition, that request had been declined by this court on the ground that the said counsel (Mr. Lakhvir Kumar, Advocate), had no authority to make a statement as no power of attorney executed in his favour by the petitioners was on record.

Today Ms. Pooja Khosla, Advocate, appears for the petitioners with the *vakalatnama* on record being in her favour as also that of Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, Advocate, though it is seen that Ms. Pooja Khosla had not

signed that *vakalatnama*. The statement of the petitioners' counsel is recorded, with the petition ordered to be dismissed as withdrawn, subject to Ms. Pooja Khosla signing the *vakalatnama* issued in her favour by the petitioners (whose signatures are seen to be present on the *vakalatnama*).

Consequently if she does not sign the *vakalatnama*, the matter would be put up again for hearing after 15 days by the Registry. If of course she signs the *vakalatnama* in the meanwhile, the petition would be deemed to have been dismissed as withdrawn with effect from today itself.

It is also to be noticed that finally a reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent-State by way of an affidavit of the DSP, Sub-Division Phagwara, District Kapurthala, dated 17.08.2021, which is ordered to be taken on record.

In the said affidavit also, it is stated that the petitioners had informed the police that they no longer seek protection of their life and liberty, they being under no threat.

Obviously if at any time in future the petitioners receive any threat to life and liberty, it would be their fundamental right to approach the SSP concerned who would then ensure that their life and liberty are duly protected, as per law.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

16.09.2021
adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No