

215 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-9007-2022

Date of Decision: 2nd December, 2022

Anshika Sharma and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

This petition is filed seeking directions to the official respondents not to harass the petitioners at the behest of private respondents and directing the official respondents to restrain private respondents from interfering in the married life of the petitioners.

On 19.9.2022, the following order was passed :-

“Learned counsel for the State appearing on advance notice on instructions submits that father of petitioner No. 1 has registered FIR No. 240 dated 22.9.2022, at Police Station Dhudli, District Maharajganj, alleging that petitioner No. 1 is minor. She further submits that petition has been filed relying upon copy of Aadhaar Card which is not a document of proof.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only at this stage.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana, appearing on advance notice accepts the same and seeks time to have instructions.

Put up on 20.10.2022.

In the meantime, the police officials not below the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police should record the

statements of the petitioners.

In case a request is made by the petitioners, they may be provided shelter in safe house till the next date.

However, it is clarified that pendency of this petition shall not be construed as an interim protection to petitioner No. 2 for not being proceeded in the FIR registered against him.”

Learned State Counsel had filed reply dated 19.10.2022 along with the statement of petitioner No.1. From the pleadings, it is forthcoming that petitioner No. 1 had committed suicide on 29.9.2022. Further, it is stated therein that petitioner No.1 has no threat perception and her in-laws are taking good care of her and now she needs no police protection.

In view of the reply, no further directions are called for.

Petition is disposed of.

It is clarified that the Court is not commenting upon the factum or validity of marriage and age of the petitioners.

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE**

2nd December, 2022

anuradha

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No