

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

CRM-M-33489 of 2015 (O&M)

Decided on: 30.9.2015.

Manpreet Kaur and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Sutikshan Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Petitioners in person.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the parties have solemnized marriage as per Hindu Marriage Act. The petitioner No.2 is 19 years of age. Their marriage is opposed by respondent Nos.4 to 7, who are the family members of petitioner No.1.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Sharma, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-Union Territory, Chandigarh. A complete copy of the paper book has been furnished to the learned State counsel, in the Court.

The petitioner No.2 not being of marriageable age as required by Section 5(iii) of the Hindu Marriage Act, therefore, this Court is not inclined to express any opinion on the validity of marriage.

However, considering the threat perception, the Court is of the view

that life of the petitioners have to be protected. In the circumstances, the respondents 1 to 3 are directed that in case the petitioners move an application before them for protection of their life and liberty, they will look into the matter and provide necessary protection to the petitioners, if they are satisfied that the life and liberty of the petitioners is threatened at the hands of respondent Nos. 4 to 7, in accordance with law. However, this shall not be deemed to be an expression on the validity of the marriage. The protection is solely granted on the assertion made by learned counsel for the petitioners with regard to threat to the safety and security of the petitioners.

Disposed of.

30.9.2015.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE