

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

CRM No.M- 2862 of 2015(O&M)

Date of Decision: January 28, 2015.

Mamta and another

..... PETITIONER (s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... RESPONDENT (s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Petitioners in person with
 Mrs. Suresh Saran, 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 respondents No.4 to 6 and other relatives because they are stated to have contracted marriage between themselves on 24.01.2015 against the wishes of the said respondents. 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, their dates of birth being 21.07.1990 and 26.12.1988, respectively. True copies of Identity Card issued by the Election Commission of India of petitioner No.1 and UIID registration receipt of petitioner No.2 have been appended with the petition as Annexures P1 and P2 though perusal of Annexure P1 and P2 shows that no

specific date is mentioned and only the year of birth of petitioner No.1 i.e., 1990 and age of petitioner No.2 i.e., 26 years has been mentioned. A copy of the Marriage Certificate and the photographs of the marriage are also placed on record as Annexures P3 and P4. Petitioner No.1 is stated to have submitted a representation dated 26.01.2015 (Annexure P5) to respondent No.2 i.e., the Superintendent of Police, Panipat for redressal of their grievance.

Notice of motion to the Advocate General, Haryana.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Nishchal Mann, Deputy 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, Panipat is directed to decide representation dated 26.01.2015 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.

January 28, 2015.
'om'

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE