

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

236

CRWP-8414 of 2020

SUNAINA AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

2.

CRWP-9272-2020

Date of Decision: 20.04.2022

GURDEV KAUR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amitoj Singh Dhaliwal, DAG, Punjab.

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRWP No.8414 of 2020 and CRWP No.9272 of 2020 as identical questions of fact and law are involved in both of them. For ease, facts are being extracted from CRWP No.8414 of 2020.

2. The co-petitioners have entered into a legal wedlock. However, the marriage of co-petitioners is opposed by co-respondents No.4 and 5 who are the parents of co-petitioner No.1.

3. After notice of motion, becoming issued to the official respondents concerned, reply to the petition on behalf of the official respondents has been furnished to the petition. A perusal of Paragraph 3 of

the reply on affidavit furnished to the petition, by the official respondents, discloses, that the co-petitioners no longer apprehend any threat to their lives and properties, as earlier hitherto purportedly emanated at the instance of co-respondents No.4 and 5.

4. Therefore, the petition claiming relief that the official respondents be directed to provide adequate security, to ward off life endangering threats, purportedly emanating from co respondents No.4 & 5, does not any longer survive, and, rather is mitigated.

5. Consequently in view of the above, the learned counsel for the petitioners seeks leave to withdraw the petition. Leave granted.

6. Dismissed as withdrawn.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

April 20, 2022
rimpal

Whether speaking / reasoned?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No