

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

115. CRWP No.885 of 2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:01.02.2024

Davinder Singh and another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Kehar Singh Hissowal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a direction to the official respondents to consider the representation dated 19.01.2024 (Annexure P-3) of the petitioners and further protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and their family members at the hands of private respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that petitioner No.2 was made unconscious and was kept forcibly by the private respondents in their illegal custody. Respondent No.4 had also filed a petition bearing CRWP No.9881 of 2023 before this Court seeking protection of life and liberty jointly with petitioner No.2 on the ground that they are in a live in relationship. It is further contended that at that time, respondent No.4 was even less than 21 years of age. It is also contended that now the petitioner No.2 has returned to her parental home and the private respondents are threatening the

petitioners and their family members with dire consequences. In this regard, a representation dated 19.01.2024 (Annexure P-3) has been submitted to the official respondents but no action has taken thereon so far.

3. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab, who appears on advance notice, on instructions from ASI Ajmer Singh submits that earlier the petitioner No.2 had approached this Court for seeking protection and now she has made a U-turn to involve the private respondents in a criminal case for the reasons best known to her. He further submits that the petition is vague as no specific date, time and manner has been mentioned therein as to how petitioners are being harassed by private respondents or there is any apprehension to their life and liberty.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case, it transpires that petitioner No.2 had willfully stayed with respondent No.4 and signed the petition seeking protection of life and liberty as well as the affidavit accompanying the said petition, which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 28.11.2023, which indicates that the matter was referred to the Mediation Centre where parents of petitioner No.2 did not agree for any resolution. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court does not find any merit in the instant petition and the same is dismissed accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

February 01, 2024
Pankaj*

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