

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

**C.R.M-M No.26266 of 2015
Date of Decision : 28.08.2015**

Rajni and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. F.S.Virk, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. A.P.S.Gill, AAG, Punjab.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is for issuance of a direction to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and not to harass them at the instance of respondent Nos.4 to 7.

Notice issued to the respondents No.4 to 7 has not been received back served or otherwise. Learned Assistant Advocate General states that no FIR has been lodged regarding the disappearance of petitioner No.1.

On the last date notice of motion was issued presumably because there was no record relating to the assertion that the petitioner No.1 was a major. Today learned Assistant Advocate General on instructions from ASI Satnam Singh states that father of the petitioner No.2 and the father of petitioner No.1 had appeared, whereas the father of the petitioner No.1 had stated that he had no objection to the marriage of the girl. As per learned Assistant Advocate General he had made no complaint regarding the minority of the girl.

In view of the matter, I do not deem it appropriate to dismiss this petition.

The petitioners have got married against the wishes of their parents. They are stated to be major. In support of her proof of age petitioner No.1 has placed on record an affidavit as age proof (Annexure P-1) wherein her date of birth is mentioned as 07.07.1997 whereas petitioner No.2 has placed on record a copy of Aadhar Card (Annexure P-2) depicting his date of birth as 16.12.1991. They have also moved a representation before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur (Annexure P-3) for protection of their life and liberty.

Without adverting to the merits of the controversy, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur to take appropriate action on the said representation (Annexures P-3).

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Criminal Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

28.08.2015

pooja sharma-I

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**