

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

110)

CRWP no.3648 of 2020 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:11.06.2020

Parminder Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH**

Present:- Mr. Swarn Tiwana, Advocate, for the petitioners.

\*\*\*

**Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)**

All the cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The petitioners are seeking protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of respondents No.4 to 9, who are stated to be the parents and other immediate relatives 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 05.06.2020. Photographs of what is stated to be a marriage ceremony have been annexed with the petition.

As regards proof of age of the petitioners, copies of their Aadhaar Cards have been annexed with the petition as Annexures P-1 and P-2 respectively, showing them to be of 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.

Consequently, since protection of life and liberty is a fundamental right of every citizen under Article 21 of the

Constitution of India, without making any comment on the validity of the marriage, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No.2 to 4 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.

As petitioner no.2 is stated to be 33 years of age as per the petition, the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, as also the SHOs of Police Station Jamalpur and Police Station Samrala, Ludhiana, are directed to determine by positive evidence as to whether either of the petitioners has been married earlier or not.

If any of the petitioners has been found married earlier, this order shall not be construed to be one making any comment on the validity of the marriage and, naturally, will not prohibit the first spouse of either of the petitioners (if that is the case) from initiating proceedings as per law, if any such proceedings lie.

With the aforesaid observations, this petition is disposed of.

11.06.2020  
vcgarg

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

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