

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANAAT
CHANDIGARH**

Crl. Misc. No.M- 18876 of 2015(O&M)

Date of Decision: June 1 , 2015.

Jyoti Devi and another

..... PETITIONER (s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... RESPONDENT (s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Petitioners in person with
 Mr. Vikram Sheoran, Advocate
 for the petitioners.

LISA GILL, J.

The present petition has been filed by the petitioners for protection of their life and liberty as they apprehend danger at the hands of respondent No.4 and other relatives because they have contracted marriage between themselves on 30.05.2015 against the wishes of the said respondent. Both the petitioners are present in Court and on being asked submit that they have contracted marriage between themselves out of their free will and volition.

It is contended that the petitioners are major, date of birth of petitioner No.1 being 04.01.1995 and age of petitioner No.2 being 27 years. True copies of Adhaar Cards of both the petitioners have been appended with the petition as Annexures P1 and P2 though perusal of Annexure P2 shows that

no specific date is mentioned and only the year of birth i.e., 1988 has been mentioned. Photographs of the marriage are also placed on record as Annexure P3. Petitioner No.1 is stated to have submitted a representation dated 30.05.2015, Annexure P4 to respondent No.2 i.e., the Superintendent of Police, Kaithal for redressal of their grievance.

Notice of motion to the Advocate General, Haryana.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Anmol Malik, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3. Two copies of the petition have been handed over to learned State counsel.

Without commenting upon the age of the petitioners or the validity of their marriage or the validity and genuineness of the certificates appended with the petition, respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Kaithal is directed to decide representation dated 30.05.2015 submitted by petitioner No.1 and take appropriate action keeping in view the threat perception to the petitioners.

It is, however, made clear that this order shall have no effect on the validity of the alleged marriage of the petitioners and neither will any other civil or criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners be barred due to this order.

Petition is disposed of accordingly.

June 1, 2015.
'om'

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE