

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

153

CRWP-2724-2019

Date of Decision: 01.01.2020.

Manpreet Masih another

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Naresh Chander, Advocate for
Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate or the petitioners.

Suvir Sehgal, J. (Oral)

Manpreet Masih (petitioner No.1) claims to be 24 years of age and Rajni Bala (petitioner No.2) claims to be 17 years, 11 months and 15 days. They have pleaded that they have married against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 8 and seek protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 8. They have placed on record photographs, Annexure P-3, claiming that they married on 30.12.2019, but the Mandir did not issue any Marriage Certificate. The petitioners have submitted a representation dated 30.12.2019, Annexure P-4 to Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar Rural.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgment of this Court in case of **Neelam Rani and another vs. State of Haryana and others, 2011(1) R.C.R. (Civil) 636**, to submit that the girl in the said case was less than 18 years of age and had been granted protection by this Court.

Accordingly, this petition is disposed of in terms of order passed by this Court in *Neelam Rani and another case (Supra)* with directions that in case the petitioners approach to respondents No. 2 and 3 setting out their grievance as are mentioned herein, the same shall be duly considered and looked into by any of them in accordance with law.

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

01.01.2020

komal

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