

118

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

**CRM-M-20460-2018
Date of Decision: 14.05.2018**

Nitesh Dabra and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. Rajender Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA J. (ORAL)

Both the petitioners are present in person and identified by their counsel. They seek protection of their life and liberty by contending that they have married each other against the wishes of their respective family members respondent Nos.4 to 6. They submitted a representation (Annexure P-4) in this regard to the Superintendent of Police, Kaithal on 09.05.2018, but are still apprehensive about their security in view of the apparent inaction and alleged clout of their family members-respondents.

2. Undisputedly, petitioner No.2 has crossed the age of majority as seen from the copy of her Aadhaar Card (Annexure P-2), petitioner No.1 is yet to cross that age although he admittedly is in the 20th year of his life according to his Aadhaar Card (Annexure P-1), and therefore, certainly appears to have attained the age of discretion. In identical circumstances, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court had allowed a similar petition on the ground that since the relief is restricted only to protection of life and liberty, this Court, in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., is not required to go into the validity of the marriage between the concerned parties (**“Neelam Rani and another Vs. State of Haryana and**

others” 2011(1) R.C.R. (Civil) 636).

3. In support of their plea, the petitioners have placed on record marriage photographs (Annexure P-3).

4. For the aforesaid reasons, this appears to be a fit case for this Court to invoke the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. and in view of the mandate contained in Article 21 of the Constitution of India to protect the citizen's right to life and liberty.

5. Thus the Superintendent of Police, Kaithal is directed to consider the representation dated 09.05.2018 (Annexure P-4) and take appropriate steps to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

6. It is nevertheless clarified that this order is issued only on the premise that petitioner No.2 has crossed the age of majority and petitioner No.1 is in 20th year of his life as seen from the documents placed on record being their Aadhaar Cards and Affidavit by petitioner No.2 in support of their marriage has been placed on record though they have not produced copy of their marriage certificate, this would not *ipso facto* amount to granting any seal of approval on the legality of their marriage which essentially would come in the domain of the concerned Matrimonial Courts. Further, they would not be entitled for any protection against their arrest or continuance of any criminal proceedings, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).

7. The petition is disposed off with the above direction.

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

14.05.2018

Bhumika

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

2. Whether reportable: No