

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

102

**CRWP-11974-2022
Decided on : 21.02.2023**

Nahida Parveen and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Neetu Singh Aashat, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Order dated 20.12.2022, says as under:-

“By way of filing this petition, petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberty in view of the fact that they have not solemnized their marriage so far and are living in a live-in relationship and are under eminent threat at the hands of respondent No.4.

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that due to inadvertent mistake in paragraph 1 of the petition, petitioners are stated to be resident of UT, Chandigarh instead of Malerkotla.

Counsel submits that petitioner No. 1-Nahida was earlier married to respondent No. 4 (Mohammad Nadeem), when she was 16 years of age. From the said wedlock, three children were born and for the last about 5 years, petitioner No. 1 was living separately from respondent No. 4. Now, petitioner No. 1 and petitioner No. 2 (who is earning on his own by doing a private job) have started living in a live-in relationship and are being threatened to be eliminated by private respondent No. 4.

On being asked by the Court, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that she would seek necessary instructions before next date of hearing as to what kind of financial security petitioner

No. 2 can provide in the name of three children of petitioner No. 1- Nahida, who are stated to be staying with them.

Adjourned to 21.02.2023.

Meanwhile, respondent No. 2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Malerkotla, would get representation dated 15.12.2022 (Annexure P-3) examined and in case any substance of truth is found in regard to the apprehension of lives and liberty of the petitioners, appropriate steps in accordance with law would be taken.

However, learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to seek necessary instruction in regard to the aforementioned submission.”

Today, on the very outset, counsel appearing for the petitioners seeks withdrawal of present petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 21, 2023

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No