

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

131

CRWP-2291-2020

Date of decision : 02.03.2020

Pooja and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Pushpinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners with the petitioners in person.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

The petitioners, who are of the age of 24 and 31 years respectively as per their Aadhar Cards, have approached this Court seeking protection of their life and liberty on the averments that the petitioners performed marriage on 27.02.2020 at Pracheen, Sri Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir, Mansa Devi Complex, Panchkula, as per Hindu rites and ceremonies against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 7 and the petitioners are apprehending threat to their life and liberty at their instance.

On perusal of the record it has transpired that in vernacular copy of Aadhar Card (Annexure P-1), the date of birth of petitioner No.1-Pooja is mentioned as 21.01.1996 but in English translation of the same her date of birth has been wrongly mentioned as 21.01.1966 due to typographical mistake and the petitioner is directed to correct the same. Registry is directed to make the correction in scanned copy as per the prescribed procedure.

Notice of motion restricted to respondents No. 1 to 3 only.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, D.A.G. Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3. Three copies of paper book have been supplied to learned State Counsel.

The petitioners, who are present in the Court and duly identified by their Counsel, have on being questioned by the Court admitted having solemnized marriage and reiterated their prayer for protection as mentioned in the petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that a representation dated 27.02.2020 (Annexure P-5) was made to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Nawanshahar, Punjab seeking necessary protection but no action has been taken so far in the matter and prays for issuance of direction in this regard.

Learned State counsel has no objection if appropriate direction for providing requisite protection to the petitioners is given.

Without examining the question of legality and validity of the marriage and expressing any opinion thereon, the petition is disposed of with the directions to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Nawanshahar, Punjab to look into the grievances of the petitioners as set out in the petition and also expressed in the representation (Annexure P-5) and take appropriate action for protection of their life and liberty as may be warranted by the circumstances.

However, it is clarified that in case any criminal case has been/is registered against petitioner No.2, then nothing in this order shall be construed as a bar to taking of appropriate action by the police authorities against him in respect thereof in accordance with law.

Registry is directed to send a copy of this order along with copy of the petition and above-said representation to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Nawanshahar, Punjab for requisite compliance.

02.03.2020

kothiyal

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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