

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

**CRWP No.4416 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of decision:03.07.2020**

Kavita and another

... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Kamal Narula, Advocate, for the petitioners.

SUVIR SEHGAL J. (ORAL)

The Court has been convened through video conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

CRM-W-500-2020

Counsel for the petitioners submits that he will file original Vakalatnama/Power of Attorney, court fee, process fee and affidavit within one week of the resumption of normal functioning of the Court. Permitted to do so.

Application is disposed of.

Main case.

Kavita daughter of Jagtar Singh (petitioner No.1) claims to be 18 years and Rajveer son of Fakir Singh (petitioner No.2) claims to be 20 years of age. They have pleaded that they have married against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 6 and seek protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 6. They have placed on record marriage certificate, Annexure P-3, evidencing their marriage. The petitioners have submitted a representation dated 30.06.2020, Annexure P-4 to respondent No.2.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgment of this Court passed by a Division Bench in **LPA No.385 of 2016 titled as *Elaichi and another Vs. State of Punjab and others*, decided on 16.05.2016** and a judgment of Co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed in **CWP No.17069 of 2019 titled as *Kawaljeet Kaur and another Vs. State of Punjab and others*, decided on 24.06.2019** to submit that even though boy was not of marriageable age, this Court had entertained their petitions for protection of their life and liberty.

Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, this petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2 to decide the representation of the petitioners, Annexure P-4 and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived.

It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as a stamp of this Court for the marriage of the petitioners.

03.07.2020

pooja saini

**(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No