

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

**CRM-M-22192-2017
Date of decision: 16.06.2017**

Preeti & Another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana & Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : Mr. Parminder Singh, 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 7, who are stated to be the parents, brother and uncle 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.

Though as regards age of petitioner No. 2, a copy of the driving license has been produced in Court, showing his date of birth to be 15.05.1989, he thereby being above the legal marriageable age. As regards age of petitioner No. 1, no firm proof of her date of birth has been produced in Court except an Aadhar Card, which is not considered to be firm proof of the 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.

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 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 16, 2017
Ansari/Shabha

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No