

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

CRM No.M-12447 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 23.03.2018.

Manpreet Kaur and Anr.

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh Rai, 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 recorded as 1998, therefore she is more than 19 years of age and as per Aadhaar Card (Annexure P-2), date of birth of petitioner No.2 is 03.01.1994 in other words, petitioner No.2 is more than 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 Shri Bharmri Devi Jan Kalyan Sanstha, Registered, Mansa Devi Market, Sector-4, Panchkula. On their marriage, petitioners were issued a marriage certificate certifying of their having got married as per Vedic Hindu rites on 21.03.2018. Though the same is not on record, original has been produced in Court. Photocopy of the same duly attested by learned counsel for the petitioners is taken on record.

Learned counsel states that the marriage was performed by the petitioners against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 7 i.e. father and other relatives 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 representation dated 21.03.2018 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2 seeking protection of their life and liberty at the hands of respondents No.4 to 7, but no action has been taken in respect thereto, therefore, they have invoked the jurisdiction of this Court.

I have considered the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners. As per claim of the petitioners they get married on 21.03.2018 at Panchkula and on the same date made a representation to the Commissioner of Police, Amritsar besides filed a petition before this Court. Petitioners did not wait for a decision by respondent No.2 on the representation submitted by them or action if any warranted in respect thereto.

Without expressing any opinion with regard to the age of the petitioners or marriage stated to have been performed by them, I am of the view that this petition is premature. Petitioners are directed to approach respondent No.2 with regard to the representation (Annexure P-4). Respondent No.2 would if aforesaid representation has not already been decided, consider and decide the same at the earliest, regard being had to the urgency. If on consideration of representation, respondent No.2 is of the view that there is threat to petitioners life and liberty at the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 7 and the circumstances of the case so warrant, then in that situation respondent No.2 shall provide appropriate security to the petitioners in accordance with law.

Petition stands disposed of in aforementioned terms.

(B.S.WALIA)
JUDGE

23.03.2018

manju

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No