

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

118

CRWP-12194-2021

Date of Decision : 23.12.2021

Rahul

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Ms. Jaspreet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Surmeet Singh Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking a direction from this Court to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect his life and liberty as he apprehends danger to his life & liberty from respondents Nos.4 to 6 as the petitioner and daughter of the private respondents Nos.4 to 6 have performed marriage on 19.12.2021, which is against the wishes of the private respondents No.4 to 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already raised the said grievance by way of a representation dated 21.12.2021 (Annexure P/5) before the respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala, which is still pending consideration with the said respondent and the petitioner will be satisfied, at this stage, in case a time bound direction is issued to respondent No.2 to decide the said

representation by passing an appropriate speaking order.

Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 3 only.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab who is present in the Court accepts notice on behalf of State of Punjab-respondent Nos.1 to 3.

Without making any observation on the merits of the case, especially in respect of the validity of marriage performed by the petitioner with the daughter of the private respondents, a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to take appropriate decision on the representation, which the petitioner alleges to have made on 21.12.2021 (Annexure P-5), expressing apprehension about danger to his life and liberty at the hands of respondents Nos.4 to 6 within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of the copy of this order. In case any merit is found in the representation, the appropriate action will be taken by respondent No.2 to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of the private respondents.

It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as an approval of this Court regarding the marriage of the petitioner and no opinion with regard to the validity of the marriage has been expressed in this order.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

December 23, 2021
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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