

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-30408 of 2016
DECIDED ON: August 29, 2016

JYOTI AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Petitioners in person along with
Mr. Tejpal Singh Dhull, Advocate.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

By virtue of the instant petition preferred 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 and 5 and their relatives, by providing them security.

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

3. At the asking of Court, Ms. Harpreet Kaur, AAG, 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.

4. 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.”

5. In view of this, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, Haryana, to look into the grievances narrated in their representation dated August 24, 2016 (Annexure P-5) 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.

6. Since, the petitioners feel apprehension at the instance of

respondents No. 4 and 5, who are outside the Court, let the Incharge, Police Post of this Court be directed to make it convenient to take the petitioners up to the ISBT, Chandigarh so that they may board a bus for their destination.

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.

8. Copy of this order be given to the learned counsel for the petitioners under the signatures of Bench Secretary of this Court.

August 29, 2016
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: ***Yes/No***

Whether reportable: ***Yes/No***