

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

118

CRWP-4215-2021

Date of Decision: 12.05.2021

Shruti Sharma & another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Rajeev Kumar Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have approached this Court seeking issuance of a direction to official respondents to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehend threat to the same at the hands of private respondents having married against the wishes of their families.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3/State, while Mr. Pankaj Khullar, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.4 i.e. the mother of petitioner No.1.

Without commenting as regards the veracity of the averments made in the petition and also as regards the validity of their alleged marriage, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to look into the matter and to dispose of the representation dated 29.04.2021

(Annexure P-5) in accordance with law. In case, it is found that there is a genuine threat to the lives and liberty of the petitioners, then necessary steps warranted under law be taken thereupon at the earliest so as to ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioners.

A copy of this order along with copy of the representation dated 29.04.2021 be sent to Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala (respondent No.2), so as to enable him to do the needful expeditiously.

It is, however, clarified that the aforesaid order shall not be taken to be any expression as regards the validity of marriage of the petitioners and shall not confer any immunity upon the petitioners, in case it is found that they have committed any wrong.

At this stage, Mr. Pankaj Khullar, learned counsel representing respondent No.4, has submitted that respondent No.4 may be permitted to talk to petitioner No.1.

Having heard Mr. Khullar, it is made clear that respondent No.4 – Rama Sharma would be at liberty to speak to her daughter - petitioner No.1 by way of video conferencing or even meet her physically in case petitioner No.1 has no objection for the same.

12.05.2021

VY/Vimal

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**Whether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**Whether reportable: **Yes/No**