

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

227

CRWP-8434-2021

Date of Decision: October 27, 2021

MISKINA AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present : Mr. Satish Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl. AG, Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI. J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with a prayer for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other direction or order directing the respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and to restrain the private respondents from harassing or interfering in the peaceful life of the petitioners.

On 06.09.2021, notice of motion was issued and the learned State counsel had sought time to seek instructions.

Mr. Sarfraz Hussain, Advocate had also appeared on behalf of respondent No.4, who is father of the petitioner No.1 and had stated that there is no threat to the petitioners from the side of respondent No.4. Thereafter, separate notices were also ordered to be issued to the other private respondents on filing of process fee and the Superintendent of Police, Mewat was also directed to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.

Reply has been filed by DSP, Firozpur Jhirka, District Nuh on behalf of the respondent No.1 i.e. State of Haryana.

Mr. Arya, learned Addl. A.G. Haryana, while referring to the affidavit filed by the State has submitted that during the course of inquiry the respectable people of village Pinagwan were joined in the inquiry proceedings and they had specifically contended that the petitioners are not residing at village Pinagwan. However, they will provide information to the local police as and when petitioner no.1 and 2 will come to the village. The statements of other persons including the Sarpanch were also recorded. Furthermore, the family members of the petitioner no.1 were also joined in the inquiry proceedings and they have categorically contended in their statements that the petitioners have solemnized their marriage out of their own free will and they have no objection for this marriage and they can reside anywhere and they will not create any danger for them. The statements of respondents No.4 to 11 were also recorded which have been annexed as Annexures R-4 to R-11, which depict that there is no apprehension of danger to the lives and liberty of the petitioners and they can take police protection and stay in Safe House at Nuh. The learned Addl. Advocate General for the State has stated that the petitioners are not apprehending any danger at the hands of the private respondents nor there is any danger from the respondents no.4 to 11 and Local Police is always ready and prepared for providing police protection to the petitioners as and when required to them.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in view of the affidavit filed by the State, the subject matter in the present case does not survive and the present petition has become infructuous.

Disposed as having become infructuous.

October 27, 2021
sham/rajender

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No