

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105)

CRWP no.9560 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.11.2020

Pooja Rani and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

All cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 Pandemic.

By this petition, the petitioners seek protection of life and liberty at the hands of respondents no. 4 to 9, upon them having married each other (as contended) against the wishes of the said respondents, on 15.11.2020.

On a specific query put to learned counsel for the petitioners, it has been stated that neither are the petitioners in any prohibited relationship to each other, nor has any of them been married earlier. He states that he has obtained specific instructions from the petitioners in that regard.

Consequently, since protection of life and liberty is a fundamental right of every citizen under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, without making any comment whatsoever on the validity of the marriage, or otherwise, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents no.2 and 3, to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not put to any harm or threat at the hands of the aforesaid respondents, or at their behest.

Since there is no firm proof of age of either of the petitioners other than their Aadhar Cards, which is actually not a firm proof of age, if any of the petitioners are found to be below marriageable age in terms of the provisions of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, this order shall not be construed to

be a bar on any proceedings initiated under that Act, the offences committed under that Act being cognizable in terms of Section 15 thereof. Admittedly, petitioner no.2 in this case is not 21 years of age, which is the legally marriageable age for a male as per the provisions of the Act of 2006.

Further, it is made clear that if any of the averments made in the petition is found to be incorrect, specifically with regard to either the petitioners being in any prohibited relationship to each other, or as regards their previous marital status, this order shall not be construed to be a bar on proceedings initiated as per law.

18.11.2020
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:Yes
Whether Reportable	: No