

109

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-7819 of 2016 (O/M)
Date of decision : 3.3.2016

Seema and another Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Petitioners in person with Mr. J.S. Saneta, Advocate.
Respondents No. 6 and 7 in person with
Mr. Ajay Saini, Advocate.

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Respondents No. 6 and 7 have put in appearance of their own, who are father and mother of petitioner No. 1.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners are major and have married against the wishes of their parents on 29.2.2016. The certificate of marriage has been placed on record as Annexure-P-1. The photographs of the marriage have been placed on file as Annexure-P-2. The true typed copies of birth certificate and Aadhar Card, showing the date of birth of petitioner No. 1 and petitioner No. 2, have been placed on file as Annexures-P-3 and P-4 respectively.

Learned counsel for respondents No. 6 and 7 states that both the petitioners are related to each other spinda and, therefore, their marriage is void.

CRM No. M-7819 of 2016 (O/M)

-2-

In the present proceedings, this Court is not to comment on the validity of the marriage as the prayer is only for protection of life and liberty of both the petitioners from private respondents No. 5 to 8.

It is claimed that the petitioners have moved an application dated 29.2.2016 (Annexure-P-5) before the Superintendent of Police, Panipat-respondent No. 2, for protecting their life and liberty as they apprehend danger to their life from the private respondents No. 5 to 8.

In these circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to Superintendent of Police, Panipat-respondent No. 2, to consider the application of the petitioners dated 29.2.2016 (Annexure-P-5) and assess the threat perception to the life and liberty of the petitioners and if it is found so, necessary steps be taken to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners. However, this order shall not be construed as a recognition of valid marriage between the parties.

Disposed of accordingly.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

3.3.2016
sjks