

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

CRWP No.4211 of 2020
Date of Decision :29.06.2020

Meena Rani and anotherPetitioners
versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present: Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate for the petitioners.

B.S. Walia, J. (VC)

1. Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to the outbreak of pandemic Covid-19.
2. Prayer in the Criminal Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, is for the issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus for directing respondent Nos.2 and 3 to provide protection of life and liberty to the petitioners as also not to interfere in the peaceful life of the petitioners at the behest of respondent No.4 and other relatives.
3. Learned counsel contends that the petitioners seek protection of their life and liberty on account of having performed marriage on 23.06.2020, against the wishes of respondent No.4. Learned counsel contends that the petitioners fulfill all the conditions stipulated under law to entitle them to get married, they are major as date of birth of petitioner No.1 as per school certificate Annexure P/1 is 06.06.1986 while that of petitioner No.2 as per Aadhaar Card Annexure P/2 is 08.02.1993. The petitioners have also attached marriage certificate Annexure P/3 dated 23.06.2020 besides photographs of marriage, Annexure P/4. Learned counsel states that the petitioners have submitted representation Annexure P/5 dated 23.06.2020 to respondent No.2 i.e. Superintendent of Police, Karnal, for redressal of their grievance but no action has been taken in

respect thereto till date and that the petitioners would be satisfied if the writ petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.2 to consider and decide the representation Annexure P/5 dated 23.06.2020, in accordance with law, in a time bound manner.

4. Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 3 only at this stage. Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and states that he has no objection to the limited prayer of the petitioners.

5. In view of the decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Lata Singh vs. State of UP and others, JT 2006 (6) SC, 173** but without commenting upon the age of the petitioners, validity of their marriage or the authenticity of the documents attached with the writ petition, the writ petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.2 i.e. Superintendent of Police, Karnal, to look into the representation Annexure P/5 dated 23.06.2020, submitted by the petitioners as expeditiously as possible and to take such action in accordance with law as may be warranted keeping in view the threat perception to the petitioners. However, it is made clear that this order shall not bar any civil or criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners in accordance with law.

6. Petition disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

29.06.2020

'Rajneesh-Rajesh-Amit'

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