

IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH

218

CWP-22030-2019

Date of Decision: 23.03.2023

NAVDEEP KAUR AND ANOTHER

... Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepanjay Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed by the petitioners for seeking protection to their lives and personal liberty at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 8.

Reply to the petition has been filed by way of affidavit of Gurpreet Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Tanda, District Hoshiarpur on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 has been filed. The relevant extract of the same is reproduced hereinafter below:

“3. That it is submitted that the police of P.S. Tanda verified that the petitioner No.1 was born on 01-03-2002 according to her Aadhar Card and she was about 17 years old when she went away with petitioner No.2. The petitioner No.1 went away with petitioner No.2 from religious Peer Nigaha, Himachal Pradesh on 12-08-2019 as per her version in the petition. The petitioners were not verified to be residing at given address in the petition. The respondent No.4 was stated to be died. The respondent No.5 to 8 stated in their statement that they came to know that the petitioners have solemnized marriage and they have no objection over their marriage and will not interfere in their married life.

However, as per direction of this Hon'ble Court, the local police of P.S. Tanda will provide police protection to the petitioners as and when they will approach the same.”

Above mentioned reply was filed in the month of September 2019 and no rejoinder to the same has yet been filed by the counsel for the petitioners rendering the facts mentioned therein as uncontroverted. It is evident from the above said reply that the respondent No.4 is no more alive and the respondents No.5 to 8 have already conveyed that they have no objection to the marriage of the petitioners and further they do not intend to interfere in the matrimonial life of the petitioners.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioners successively for the last two dates. It seems that the petitioners have no surviving grievance and are no longer interested in pursuing the present petition.

Dismissed for want of prosecution.

23.03.2023.
rajender

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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