

121

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

CRM-M No.8183 of 2017

Date of Decision: 09.03.2017

Priyanaka and another

.....Petitioners

Vs

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

In this petition, petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary directions to the official respondents to protect their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by the private respondents. Petitioners claimed themselves to be major and have contacted marriage according to their own sweet will, but against the wishes of their family members. Photographs and Marriage Certificate are sought to be pressed into service in order to project validity of marriage.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents, petitioners have prayed for necessary directions for safeguarding their personal civil and legal rights. In the aforesaid context, petitioners have allegedly moved

representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, UT, Chandigarh.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Addl. P.P., UT, Chandigarh accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No.1 to 3.

At this juncture, this Court is not in a position to comment upon the validity of marriage and majority of the petitioners in terms of their respective ages, however, respondent No.2 can be asked to have a fair look on the grievance of the petitioners in order to ascertain veracity of allegations made by the petitioners. Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his/her own mechanism to ascertain the truth. He/she would also be at liberty to join the petitioners or any other person acquainted with facts in issue. In case respondent No.2 finds that there is some truth in the allegations of the petitioners, then he/she shall proceed to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without meaning anything on the merits of the case. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any observation made by the Court in terms of pleadings at this stage. This order shall not debar the official

respondents from proceeding against any of the party in accordance with law in case they are involved in some other case. It would be appreciated if the representation filed by the petitioners is decided within a period of one month from today keeping in view the threat perception shown by the petitioners.

Petition stands disposed of.

March 09, 2017

jyoti Y.

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No