

CRM-M-2730-2018

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

CRM-M-2730-2018

Date of Decision: 22.01.2018

Minu and another

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners, who are present in the court, are seeking protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of respondents No. 4, who is stated to be the father of petitioner no. 1, on account of the fact that they have married each other of their own free will, against the wishes of the said respondents on 19.01.2018. Photographs of what is stated to be a marriage ceremony have been annexed with the petition.

As regards proof of age of both the petitioners, a photocopy of the Voter Card, issued by the Election Commission of India, in respect of petitioner no. 1 and a photocopy of the Aadhar card, issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India, in respect of petitioner no. 2, have been annexed with the petition as Annexures P-1 and P-2 respectively, the originals of which have been produced in Court. As per the said identity cards, both petitioners are above the legally marriageable age.

On a specific query put to learned counsel for the petitioners, it has been stated that neither are the petitioners in any prohibited relationship to each other, nor has any of them been married earlier. He states that he has obtained specific instructions from the petitioners in that regard.

Consequently, since protection of life and liberty is a fundamental right of every citizen under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, without commenting on the validity of the marriage, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No. 2 and 3 to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not put to any harm or threat at the hands of the aforesaid respondents or at their behest.

However, it is made clear that if any of the averments made in the petition is found to be incorrect, specifically with regard to either the petitioners being in any prohibited relationship to each other, or as regards their previous marital status, or with regard to their age, this order shall not be construed to be a bar on proceedings initiated as per law.

January 22, 2018
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No.