

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

**CRM-M-21804-2017
Date of decision: 12.06.2017**

Sukhvir Kaur & Another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana & Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : Mr. Pardeep Sihmar, 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 and 5, who are stated to be parents of petitioner No.1, on account of the fact that they have married each other of their own free will, against the wishes of the said respondents on 11.06.2017. Photographs of what is stated to be a marriage ceremony have been annexed with the petition as Annexure P-4.

As regards proof of age of the petitioners, typed copies of the Aadhar Cards issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India, have been annexed with the petition as Annexures P-1 and P-2 respectively, showing the dates of birth of petitioners. Learned counsel for the petitioners has also produced the original matriculation certificate of petitioner No. 2, showing his date of birth to be 05.05.1995. However, no firm proof of the age of petitioner No. 1 has been given, as only a photocopy of her matriculation certificate has been produced in Court, which shows her date of birth to be 07.07.1997.

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.

Consequently, since protection of life and liberty is a fundamental right of every citizen under 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*