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

Crl. Misc. No.M-21938 of 2017

Date of Decision: June 14, 2017

Gulshan Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Rajeev K. Kapila, 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 of petitioner No.2 and the father of petitioner No.1 respectively, on account of the fact that they have married each other of their own free will, on 13.06.2017. Photographs of what is stated to be a marriage ceremony have been annexed with the petition.

As regards the proof of age of petitioner No.1, the “original” Secondary Education Certificate issued by the Board of Higher Secondary Education, Delhi, showing his date of birth to be 14.12.1992, has been produced and as regards the proof of age of petitioner No.2, the Matriculation Examination Certificate issued by the Punjab School Education Board, showing her date of birth to be 22.10.1996, has been

produced in Court.

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. He submits that he has obtained specific instructions from the petitioners in that regard.

Consequently, since protection of life 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 any proceedings initiated as per law.

(Amol Rattan Singh)

Judge

June 14, 2017

sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No