

Sr. No.250

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

**CRM-M-14454-2018
Date of decision:16.10.2018**

Pooja Rani and another

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Malik, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Mamta Tanwar, Advocate for
Ms. Vijay Lakshmi, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

Rajbir Sehrawat, J(Oral)

This is a petition seeking direction to respondents No. 1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of the respondents No. 4 to 7.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioners.

A perusal of the file shows that on 06.04.2018, the following Order was passed:-

*“Notice of motion for
25.4.2018.*

*In the meanwhile, respondent
No.2-Superintendent of Police, Ambala is
directed to take care about the lives and
liberty of the petitioners.*

*It is made clear that this order
may not be construed as expression of an
opinion on legality and validity of the*

marriage of the petitioners.

*In case any criminal case is
pending against petitioner No.2, this order
shall not be any hindrance to proceed
according to law.”*

Thereafter, matter was sent to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. However, during the mediation also, no positive result have come up.

The State has filed reply by way of affidavit of Madan Lal HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Ambala dated 28.08.2018. In reply, it has been stated that petitioners are availing facility of supervisory security for their safety from local police.

However, it has been pointed out that since petitioner No.2 is not of the prescribed age of marriage, therefore, the case under Section 9 of Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006 is registered in the matter.

Since the petitioners are already availing supervisory security as pointed out by the police, therefore, no further orders are required in the matter.

However, it is clarified that this Order shall not be taken as any expression on merit qua the validity of marriage or qua any proceedings pending or contemplated against the petitioners under any relevant law.

Disposed of.

16th October, 2018

Shivani Kaushik

**[RAJBIR SEHRAWAT]
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable *Yes/No*