

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

CRM No.M-12387 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 23.03.2018.

Payal Sood and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.S.WALIA

Present: Ms. Kuljinder Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioners.

B.S.WALIA, J.

Learned counsel contends that as per Aadhaar Card (Annexure P-1), date of birth of petitioner No.1 is 06.08.1994 in other words she is more than 22 years of age while as per Aadhaar Card (Annexure P-2), date of birth of petitioner No.2 is 25.10.1993 in other words petitioner No.2 is about 24 years of age. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioners fulfill all conditions stipulated under law to entitle them to get married and on account of mutual liking for each other, they got married on 21.03.2018 at Prachin Shri Shiv Mandir, MDC, Panchkula. Marriage certificate is not on record. However, original has been produced in Court. Photocopy of the same duly attested by learned counsel for the petitioner is taken on record.

Learned counsel states that the marriage was performed by the petitioners against the wishes of father, mother and sister-in-law of petitioner No.1, who are threatening the petitioners with harm to their life and liberty for having married against their wishes. Petitioners claim to have given a

representation dated 21.03.2018 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2 seeking protection of their life and liberty against the threats held out to them by respondent Nos.4 to 6.

I have considered the submissions of learned counsel.

Petitioners got married on 21.03.2018, submitted a representation to respondent No.2 on the same day besides filed the petition in this Court on said date itself. Apparently, the petition has been filed without waiting for the outcome of decision on the representation (Annexure P-4) submitted to respondent No.2 or action if any in respect thereto.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion with regard to the age of petitioners or the marriage stated to have been performed by them, I am of the view that the petition is premature. Petitioners are directed to approach respondent No.2, who if he has not already decided representation (Annexure P-4) and taken action in respect thereto as may be warranted under law, consider and decide the same and take action as may be warranted in accordance with law regard being had to be the urgency qua the threats to the petitioners at the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 6.

Petition stands disposed of in aforementioned terms.

(B.S.WALIA)
JUDGE

23.03.2018

rajesh.k.khurana

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No