

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

CRWP-581-2023

Date of Decision:20.04.2023

Harpreet Kaur and Others

...Petitioners

vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Amit Puri, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jasbir Singh Mohri, Advocate
for respondents No.4 to 6.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

The petitioners had moved the instant petition before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to direct respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehended threat at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioners No.1 and 2 had solemnized their marriage on 19.06.2022 in the presence of approximately ten family members of both the petitioners. However, respondents No.4 to 6 had not accepted their marriage. After the marriage, respondents No.4 to 6 gave false assurances to petitioners No.1 and 2 that they would never cause harm to them. On 13.01.2023, both the petitioners had gone to the house of respondents No.4 to 6 to attend some religious ceremony, however, respondents No. 4 to 6 opened lethal attack on them and they were seriously injured. They even moved a representation dated 16.01.2023, Annexure- P5 to the office of respondent No.2, however, no action was taken

on the same.

In response to the notice, a reply by way of an affidavit of Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala has been filed before the Court.

Learned State counsel contends that the statement of petitioner No.2 was recorded regarding the scuffle and injuries sustained by him and on the basis of the statement as well as the MLR No. MLR/VM/14E/1/2023 of petitioner No.2 depicting five injuries, a case FIR No.13 dated 16.01.2023, under Sections 341, 323, 427, 506, 148, 149 of IPC, Police Station Kotwali, Patiala, Annexure R1-T has been registered against respondents No.4 to 6. Learned State counsel further contends that the private respondents had been arrested by the investigating agency and were released on bail, as the offences were bailable in nature. Learned State counsel further contends that a detailed enquiry had been conducted on the basis of the representation dated 16.01.2023 and since the allegations levelled in the said representation were almost similar to the allegations levelled by the complainant in the present FIR, Annexure-R1/T, no further action was taken in the case. Learned State counsel further contends that in case the petitioners still are threatened by anyone, they have free to move a representation to the police and proper action shall be taken in accordance with law.

In view of the statement made by the learned State counsel, it would be appropriate to give a quietus to the present petition and the petition is disposed off accordingly.

20.04.2023
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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