

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-W-234-2024 in/and
CRWP-1715-2024
Date of decision 15.04.2024

IKRAM AND ANOTHER

....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: None for the applicants/petitioners.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J (Oral):

1. Reply filed by way of affidavit dated 12.04.2024 of Mukesh Kumar HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Tauru District Nuh, is taken on record. Stand of the respondent-State has been spelled out in para No.2 of the preliminary submission which read as under:-

“That the petitioner has preferred present petition u/s 226 of the constitution of India praying for issuing direction to respondent no. 1-3 for protection of life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of private respondents no. 4 to 7 and not to harass or interfere in the married life of the petitioners at the instance of the private respondents, who are annoyed due to love marriage of the petitioners against their wishes.

In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that after receiving the notice of the present petition an enquiry has been conducted by the local police and during the course of enquiry, petitioner and private respondents were asked to join the enquiry proceedings. However, the petitioners were not found residing at the given address. The Sarpanch village Panchayat was joined in the enquiry proceedings and she has 1

CRM-W-234-2024 in/and
CRWP-1715-2024

-2-

specifically contended that the petitioners have neither resided in village Khorī nor they are presently residing in village Khorī. Her statement is annexed as Annexure R-1. It is also pertinent to mention here that private respondents were also joined in the enquiry proceedings and they have specifically contended in their statements that petitioners no. 1 and 2 have solemnized marriage at their free will and they have no objection on their marriage. The petitioners can reside anywhere as per their wishes. The statements of the private respondent no. 4 to 7 are annexed as Annexure R-2 to R-5”

- 2. In view of the above no further order is required to be passed.
- 3. Disposed of accordingly.
- 4. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

15.04.2024
monika

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