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

136

Crl. Misc. No.M-21947 of 2017

Date of Decision: June 14, 2017

Sonam and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Bhateja, 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 9, who are stated to be the parents and other immediate relatives of petitioner No.1, on account of the fact that they have married each other of their own free will, on 09.06.2017. A copy of a 'Nikahnama', dated 09.06.2017, has been annexed with the petition.

As per the copies of the Identity Cards issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India (Aadhar Cards), annexed with the petition, (the originals of which have been produced in Court), the petitioners are shown to be of legally marriageable age.

On a specific query put to learned counsel for the petitioners, it has been stated that the petitioners are not in any prohibited relationship to each other. However, petitioner No.2 is stated to be earlier married to one-Razima, who is not a party to the petition, but the said petitioner, being a Muslim, and petitioner No.1 also stated to have converted to Islam, he submits that the marriage of the petitioners to each other would be

valid.

No comment is made, whatsoever, by this Court on the validity of the marriage, this being only a petition seeking protection of lives and liberty of the petitioners, which is a fundamental right of every citizen enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Consequently, it 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

Whether reportable: No