

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25841 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: July 29, 2016

Preeti and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Petitioners in person along with
Ms. Savita Tanwar, Advocate.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

CRM-M-22976-2016

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

At the very outset of the arguments, it has come to the notice of this Court that date of marriage is 04.07.2016, which has wrongly been mentioned as 04.04.2016.

2. By virtue of the instant petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have sought issuance of directions to respondents No. 2 & 3 to protect their lives and liberty as they feel apprehension of danger at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7 and their

relatives, by providing them security.

3. Notice to respondents No.1 to 3, only at this stage.

4. At the asking of Court, Ms. Neelam Kashyap, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana. Copy of the petition be supplied to learned State counsel during the course of day.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that both the petitioners are major. Even though this court is disinclined to entertain and to go into such allegations, but at the same time it cannot be oblivious to the fact that because of social friction and sectarian differences such incidents are not entirely unheard of and prima facie the case also appears to be covered by the observations of Supreme Court in **Fiaz Ahmed Ahanger & Ors. v. State of J & K 2009(3) R.A.J.692**, which are as under :-

“In such cases of intercaste or inter-religion marriage the Court has only to be satisfied about two things :

(1) that the girl is above 18 years of age, in which case, the law regards her as a major vide Section 3 of the Indian Majority Act, 1875. A major is deemed by the law to know what is in his or her welfare.

(2) The wish of the girl.

In the circumstances, we direct that nobody will harass, threaten or commit any acts of violence or other unlawful act on the petitioners, Chanchali Devi/Mehvesh Anjum and the petitioner's family members and they shall not be arrested till further orders in connection with the case in question. If they feel insecure, they can apply to the police and, in such event, the police shall grant protection to them.”

6. In view of this, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Superintendent of Police, District Jind, to look into the grievances narrated in their representation dated July 04, 2016 (Annexure P-4) and to take appropriate action in accordance with law to ensure that no harm is caused to the lives and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.

7. This order shall not be construed to be conferring the legitimacy or authenticity to the factum of marriage having been performed as well as their age, as the Court is clearly deprived of any means to determine the aforesaid facts.

July 29, 2016

sonika

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No