

116

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

CRWP No.862 of 2020

Date of Decision: 27.01.2020

Anmol Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Vs

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present:Petitioner in-person along with
Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

In this petition, petitioners have approached this Court for seeking directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by private respondents No.4 to 8.

Petitioner No.1 is aged about 18 years but has not achieved marriageable age of 21 years. Similar, petitioner No.2 is aged 17 years and 6 months and has not completed age of 18 years. They alleged to have contracted marriage on 20.01.2020 as per Hindu Rites and Ceremonies, but against the wishes of their family members. Photographs of marriage

(Annexure P-3) are sought to be pressed into service in order to project validity of marriage.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents, petitioners have prayed for necessary directions for safeguarding their personal civil and legal rights.

In the aforesaid context, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 20.01.2020 (Annexure P-4) to the Commissioner of Police, Amritsar.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No.1 to 3.

At this juncture, this Court is not in a position to comment upon the validity of marriage and majority of the petitioners in terms of their respective ages, however, respondent No.2 can be asked to have a fair look on the grievance of the petitioners in order to ascertain veracity of allegations made by the petitioners.

Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his/her own mechanism to ascertain the truth. He/she would also be at liberty to join the petitioners or any other person acquainted with facts in issue. In case respondent No.2 finds that there is some truth in the allegations of the petitioners, then he/she shall

proceed to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without meaning anything on the merits of the case. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any observation made by the Court in terms of pleadings at this stage. This order shall not debar the official respondents from proceeding against any of the party in accordance with law in case they are involved in some other case. It would be appreciated if the representation filed by the petitioners is decided within a period of one month from today keeping in view the threat perception shown by the petitioners.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

January 27, 2020
geeta

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No