

CRWP-6700-2020

Date of decision: 02.09.2020

KOMALPREET KAUR AND ANR.

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURIPresent: Mr. Kanhiya Soni, Advocate
for the petitioners.

*(The case has been taken up through video conferencing on
account of Covid-19 Pandemic).***VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)**

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Nandakumar and another Versus State of Kerala and others, AIR 2018 SC 2254** and judgment of this Court in **CWP No. 31834 of 2019 titled as Megha and another Versus State of Haryana and others, decided on 04.11.2019.**

It has been stated that although petitioner No.2 has attained the age of majority but has not attained the marriageable age. The petitioners are staying together and contemplated to solemnize marriage, when petitioner No.2 attains the age for a valid marriage. The petitioners are apprehending threat and danger to their lives and liberty at the instance of respondent Nos. 4 to 7 who are the relatives of petitioner No.1.

Without dilating further, suffice it to say that the Court is primarily concerned with the petitioners' right to protect their lives and liberty against any

to them as per Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

It has been pointed out that a representation dated 28.08.2020 (Annexure P-3) has already been submitted to respondent No.2.

Notice of motion to official respondents only.

Mr. H.S. Sitta, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Copy of the paper-book be supplied to him during the course of the day through email.

Without making any further observations on the merits or legality and validity of the relationship, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to look into the grievance of the petitioners as projected through a representation dated 28.08.2020 (Annexure P-3) in accordance with law and furthermore, take remedial action if the apprehension of danger is real and genuine one.

This order is not to be construed as any opinion with regard to the legality and validity of the relationship, or the age of the petitioners or with regard to any civil or criminal proceedings.

02.09.2020
renubala

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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