

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

**CRM-M-22142-2017
Date of decision: 16.06.2017**

Sehajpreet Kaur & Another

...Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Punjab & Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : Ms. Avinash Mandla, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. S. S. Siao, Advocate,
as mediator.

Mr. Anil Kumar Rana, Advocate,
for respondents No. 4 and 5.

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 the parents of petitioner No. 1, on account of the fact that they have married each other of their own free will on 14.06.2017. Photographs of what is stated to be a marriage ceremony have been annexed with the petition.

As regards the age of the petitioners, typed copies of a matriculation certificate issued by the Punjab School Education Board and an Aadhar Card issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India, have been annexed with the petition, showing their dates of birth to be 03.06.1999 and 25.09.1984 respectively.

The girl having turned 18 years on 03.06.2017, learned counsel

for respondents No. 4 and 5 has appeared and submitted that the parents wish to meet their daughter, petitioner No. 1. Upon that request, this Court directed that the petitioners and the said respondents meet each other down stairs in the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court and Mr. S. S. Sio, Advocate, who was present in Court, was asked to mediate between them. Mr. Sio is also stated to be a Mediator on the panel of this Court.

The learned Mediator having returned along with the parties and their counsel some time later, has stated that petitioner No. 1 is admittedly above the age of 18 years even as per respondents No. 4 and 5, and has refused to go with them, upon which respondents No. 4 and 5 have reconciled themselves to the situation and have nothing to say further, they obviously not being happy with the marriage of petitioner No. 1 with a person who is 14 years older to her.

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 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 duly protected within the four corners of law.

However, it is made clear that if any of the averments made in the petition is found to be false in any manner, either with regard to the age of petitioners, or their previous marital status or with regard to their being in any prohibited relationship to each other, this order shall not be construed to

be a bar on proceedings initiated as per law.

It is specifically clarified that if petitioner No. 2 is found to have been married earlier, he having specifically stated on query of this Court that he is not married earlier, proceedings as per law will continue.

June 16, 2017
Ansari/Shabha

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No