

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

**CRM-M No. 18431 of 2018
DATE OF DECISION :- May 02, 2018**

Sheetal and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAN

Present:- Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate for the petitioners.

It is contended that petitioner no. 1 Sheetal, aged about 18 years has married petitioner no. 2 Ravi Kumar, aged about 20 years, against the wishes of her family members, arrayed as respondents no. 4 and 5 who are threatening to interfere in their marital life, as such to seek protection in that regard, the petitioners have approached this Court by way of filing the present petition.

Admittedly, Ravi Kumar-petitioner no.2 is aged less than 21 years. In that way a marriage between the petitioners cannot be termed as a valid marriage since requirements of Section 5 of the Hindu Marriage Act are not fulfilled but at the same time no physical harm to the petitioners at the hands of any other person can be allowed to be caused.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana accepted notice on behalf of respondents no. 1 to 3.

Mr. Deepak K. Bartia, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondents no. 4 and 5 by filing vakalatnama, which be taken on record.

As a matter of fact, respondent no. 4 Mahabir Singh-father of petitioner no.1 Sheetal is present in the Court. At his request he has been allowed to meet Sheetal in the Court.

Learned counsel for the private respondents states that such respondents have neither interfered in the marital life of the petitioners nor would they do so. However, learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners have got apprehension of physical harm at the hands of private respondents and the persons claiming under them, therefore, necessary order granting protection to them be passed.

The petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no. 2 The Commissioner of Police, District Panipat to take necessary steps to ensure that lives and liberty of the petitioners are not jeopardised at the hands of respondents no. 4 and 5 and the persons claiming under them. However, this direction will not validate the marriage said to have taken place between the petitioners and will have no effect on any civil or criminal action which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

**(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE**

May 02, 2018

p.singh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No