

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

CRM-M-21778-2017
Date of decision: 12.06.2017

Parminder Kaur & Another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana & Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioners, who are present in the Court, are seeking protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 6, who are stated to be the parents and uncle of petitioner No. 1, on account of the fact that they have married each other of their own free will on 09.06.2017. Photographs of what is stated to be a marriage ceremony have been annexed with the petition.

In support of proof of age of petitioner No. 1, a typed copy of the PAN Card issued by the Income Tax Department, Govt. of India, has been annexed with the petition, (the original of which has been produced in Court), showing her date of birth to be 01.07.1998, thus making her about 19 years of age.

As regards petitioner No. 2, a typed copy of Aadhar Card issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India has been annexed with the petition showing his date of birth to be 04.05.1992, thus making him about 25 years of age.

On a specific query put to learned counsel for the petitioners, it has been stated that neither are the petitioners in any prohibited relationship to each other, nor has any of them been married earlier.

Though an Aadhar Card is not a firm proof of date of birth of any person since no verification is done by the Unique Identification Authority of India in respect of the date of birth disclosed by the applicant for an Aadhar Card, however, since protection of lives and liberty is a fundamental right of every citizen enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No. 2 and 3 to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not put to any harm or threat at the hands of the aforesaid respondents or at their behest.

However, it is made clear that if any of the averments made in the petition is found to be incorrect, specifically with regard to either the petitioners being in any prohibited relationship to each other, or as regards their previous marital status, or with regard to their age, this order shall not be construed to be a bar on proceedings initiated as per law.

June 12, 2017
Ansari

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No