

118

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

CRWP No. 6859 of 2021
Date of Decision: 26.07.2021

Amandeep Kaur

-Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Gaurav Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition for issuance of necessary directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect her life and personal liberty from being invaded by private respondents No.4 to 6.

Petitioner has alleged that respondent No.4 is adoptive father of the petitioner. Respondent No.5 is biological mother of the petitioner and respondent No.6 is real brother of the petitioner.

Petitioner is major according to her date of birth i.e. 01.01.1997. Petitioner does not wish to get married according to

wishes of private respondents as she is girl of modern time. Petitioner does not wish imposition of any restrictions on her study/work schedule. She has alleged that owing to the conduct of private respondents, she has gone to the house of her real sister namely Veerpal Kaur and her husband namely Kulwinder Singh who are living in village Lohgarh, Tehsil Sardoolgarh, District Mansa.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Anant Kataria, D.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

At this stage, Mr. Ajay Arora, Advocate appears on behalf of respondents No.4 to 6 and submits that Veerpal Kaur and two minor children have been shunted out from matrimonial house by Kulwinder Singh at the instance of the petitioner who is living with Kulwinder Singh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner refutes the aforesaid contention and submits that infact Veerpal Kaur was married to elder brother of Kulwinder Singh and after his demise, Veerpal Kaur is living with Kulwinder Singh under some alleged custom.

Petitioner has already filed a representation before respondent No.2 on 20.07.2021.

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to

pass, there is no necessity of calling upon any response from the respondents, as no order prejudicial to the interest of any party is being passed.

At this stage, without forming any opinion on the allegations and counter allegations of the parties, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the present petition by directing respondent No.2 to look into the grievance of the parties by calling them in person. Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his own ways and means to establish truth and take appropriate action against the defaulting party in accordance with law. In case, contention of the petitioner is established, respondent No.2 would take all corrective steps in the context of protection qua her life and personal liberty.

It would be appreciated if the needful is done within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

July 26, 2021

Jyoti Sharma

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

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