

120

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

**CRM NO. M-50546 OF 2018 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 16.11.2018**

Jasmer Singh and another

...Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present : Mr. Shvetanshu Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

RAJBIR SEHRAWAT, J. (ORAL)

CRM NO. 40376 OF 2018

The application is allowed, subject to just exceptions.

MAIN CASE

Both the petitioners are present in person and identified by their counsel. They seek protection of their life and liberty by contending that both of them having attained the age of majority, have married each other against the wishes of their respective family members/respondents No.4 and 5 and so seek appropriate protection from the authorities. They submitted a representation dated 13.03.2018 (Annexure P-5) in this regard to the **Superintendent of Police, Karnal**, but are still apprehensive about their security in view of the apparent inaction and alleged clout of their family members/respondents.

Both of them do appear to have crossed the age of majority as seen from the copies of documents filed and have married each other, in support of which photographs (Annexure P-4) have been placed on record.

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.

Thus, the Superintendent of Police, Karnal, is directed to consider the representation dated 13.03.2018 (Annexure-P-5) and take appropriate steps to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

It is nevertheless clarified that this order is issued only on the premise that the petitioners have crossed the age of majority as seen from the documents placed on record being **Aadhaar Cards** of petitioners No.1 and 2 (**Annexures P-1 and P-2**). The marriage Certificate is annexed as Annexure P-3. 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).

The petition is disposed off with the above direction.

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 16, 2018
shalini

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>