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

152

Crl. Misc. No.M-22252 of 2017

Date of Decision: June 16, 2017

Poonambir Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ranjodh Singh Sidhu, 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.5 to 7, who are stated to be the father and other relatives 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 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 neither are the petitioners in any prohibited relationship to each other, nor has any of them been married

earlier. He states that he has obtained specific instructions in that regard.

Though an Aadhar Card is not firm proof of 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, however, 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 to 4 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 16, 2017

sonia g./m. sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No