

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

**110**

**CRWP-4711-2020**

**Date of Decision: 13.07.2020.**

Shanuma alias Pooja and another

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents.

\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL**

----

**Present:** Mr. Sunil Kumar Dhanda, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**Suvir Sehgal, J. (Oral)**

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

Shanuma alias Pooja (petitioner No.1) claims to be 20 years and Sher Singh son of Karan Pal (petitioner No.2) claims to be 20 years of age. They have pleaded that they have married against the wishes of respondents No.4 and 5 and seek protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 and 5. They have placed on record photographs, Annexure P-4, claiming that they solemnized the marriage on 07.07.2020 in Mandir according to Hindu rites and ceremonies. In paragraph 5 of the petition, they have claimed that the Managing Committee of the Mandir i.e. Tridev Sanatan Dharam Parchar Samiti (Regd.) Booth No.249, MDC, Sector 4, Panchkula has issued a certificate of marriage of the petitioners. The petitioners have submitted a representation Annexure P-5 to Superintendent of Police, Panipat and Station House Officer, Police Station Bapoli, District Panipat.

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, I dispose of the petition with directions to respondents No.2 to decide the representation of the petitioners, Annexure P-5 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.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)  
JUDGE

13.07.2020

*komal*

|                            |   |         |
|----------------------------|---|---------|
| Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes/ No |
| Whether Reportable         | : | Yes/ No |