

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

**Crl. Misc. No.M-8967 of 2017 (O&M)  
Date of decision : March 16, 2017**

Reena and another

... Petitioners

**VERSUS**

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA**

Present: Petitioners in person with  
Mr. S.K. Gupta, Advocate.

**SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)**

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 is 19 years of age but petitioner No.2 is below 21 years of age but has married petitioner No.1 on 14.03.2017. This marriage is against the wishes of parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1, who are now posing threat to their life and liberty. He has limited his prayer for taking appropriate action in accordance with law on the representation dated 14.03.2017 (Annexure P-5) submitted by petitioner No.1 to Superintendent of Police, Hisar.

Perusal of copy of Aadhaar Card of petitioner No.2 shows that his date of birth is 01.01.1997 and he is 20 years of age, as such, was not eligible to marry.

However, keeping in view threat perception and submission of learned counsel for the petitioners, but without expressing any opinion on the validity of marriage of petitioners, petition is disposed of with direction

to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Hisar to look into representation dated 14.03.2017 (Annexure P-5) and take appropriate action in accordance with law, on receipt of copy of this order along with representation in his office. He is also directed to initiate action, if any, required under the provision of Child Marriage Restraint Act, against the party at fault.

However, it is made clear that this order will have no effect on the validity of alleged marriage of the petitioners or on any other civil or criminal proceedings instituted against them.

**March 16, 2017.**  
*Sachin M.*

**(SURINDER GUPTA)**  
**JUDGE**

***Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No***

***Whether Reportable: Yes/No***