

CRWP-6714-2020

Date of decision: 02.09.2020

ARTI AND ANR.

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Rakesh Bakshi, 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 though petitioner No.1 was earlier married with respondent No.6 namely Kapil but he was already married and having child from the earlier marriage. Petitioner No.1 was harassed by the family members of her in-laws. A child was also born to her from her wedlock with respondent No.6. Petitioner No.1 has been turned out of the matrimonial home and the child has been forcibly kept by respondent No.6. Petitioner No.1 is presently staying with petitioner No.2.

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 26.08.2020 (Annexure P-1) has already been submitted to respondent No.2.

Notice of motion to official respondents only.

Mr. Amrik Singh Narwal, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

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 26.08.2020 (Annexure P-1) 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