

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

111)

CRWP no.3775 of 2020

Date of Decision: 16.06.2020

Pooja and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Suresh Kumar Arya, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

All 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.

By this petition, the petitioners seek protection of life and liberty at the hands of respondents no. 4 to 6, who are stated to be the parents and other relatives of petitioner no.1, upon them having married each other (as contended) against the wishes of the said respondents, on 12.6.2020.

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 making any comment whatsoever on the validity of the marriage, or otherwise, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents no.2 and 3 respectively, 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.

Since there is no firm proof of age before this court of either of the petitioners, a specific direction is given that their age shall be determined from the schools that they studied in, after making enquiries from there, and if either of them is found to be below the legally marriageable age for females and males respectively (18 years and 21 years), proceedings under the provisions of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, shall be initiated as per law.

Further, 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, this order shall not be construed to be a bar on proceedings initiated as per law.

16.06.2020
Vcgarg/dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No