

2023:PHHC:135326

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP -9104-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision : 17.10.2023

Harpreet Singh and another Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present :- Ms. Himani, Advocate for
Mr. Chandan Singh Rana, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Shukla, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

1. Parties invoked jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for direction to respondent nos. 2 to protect their life and liberty.

2. Reply on behalf of State has been filed. The same is taken on record. The stand of the State is based upon the statements of the parents of the petitioners, which reads as under:-

“4. That after receiving information about the present petition, local police of P.S. Baghapurana has enquired into the matter to check the veracity of allegations and to assess any threat perception to petitioners from the hands of private respondents who are parents of petitioner no.2. The statements of parents of both the petitioners have been recorded and same are annexed herewith as Annexure R-1/T and R-2/T respectively.

5. *That petitioners have not been verified to be residing at their given address and even parents of petitioner no.1 have no knowledge about the current location of the petitioners. However, family members and parents of both the petitioners have expressed their consent with their decision to marry each other and have given undertaking they will not extent any threat to the petitioners in future. Family members of petitioners are not even against their decision to live in relationship and the complaint made by father of petitioner No.1- Harjinder Singh against petitioner No.1- Harpreet Singh has also been withdrawn by him.*
6. *That the District Police is ready to provide adequate protection to the petitioners in case of any genuine apprehension of life and liberty. However, in the given facts and circumstances, there is no immediate threat perception to the petitioners and as such the present petition deserves to be dismissed.”*

3. In view of the stand taken by the State, the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

4. Ordered accordingly.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

17.10.2023

VS

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable :

Yes
No