

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

CRWP-9964-2020 (O&M)

Date of decision : 02.12.2020

Raman and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present: Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The present criminal writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to provide adequate security/police protection to the petitioners as they are apprehending grave danger at the hands of respondent Nos.4 and 5.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that both the petitioners are major and have solemnized their marriage on 25.11.2020 against the wishes of their parents and relatives. In support of age-proof, the affidavits of both the petitioners have been annexed with the petition as Annexures P-3 and P-4 respectively and as per the affidavits date of birth of petitioner No.1 is 08.02.2001 and that of petitioner No.2 is 04.01.1999. Learned counsel for the petitioners has further contended that the petitioners are receiving serious threats and apprehend grave danger to their life and liberty. The petitioners have also sent a representation dated 25.11.2020 (Annexure P-5) to respondent Nos.2 and 3 for providing adequate security. However, no action has been taken till date.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Samina Dhir, DAG, Punjab has joined the session through video conferencing and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent(s)-State.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Without expressing any opinion with regard to the veracity of the contents of the petition and the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the present petition is disposed off with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Pathankot, respondent No.2, to decide the representation dated 25.11.2020 (Annexure P-5) and take necessary action as per law. Since no document except for affidavits have been attached with the petition as age proof, the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Pathankot, respondent No.2, shall ask for the age proofs of the petitioners at the time of deciding of the representation.

It is, however, made clear that this order shall not, in any manner, be construed as an expression of opinion on the veracity of the statement made by the petitioners or on the validity of the marriage and shall have no effect on any other civil or criminal proceedings, if any, instituted/pending against them.

December 02, 2020
kv

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No