

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

CRWP-1831-2020.
Date of Decision:-13.08.2021.

Nancy and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sansar Kundu, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Manish Dadwal, AAG, Haryana.

(Through Video Conferencing)

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

Petitioners have filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect the life and personal liberty of the petitioners.

On 18.02.2020, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court had passed the following order:-

“It is contended that the petitioner No.1

Nancy, aged about 18 years has got married with

petitioner No.2 Nehul Mor, aged less than 21 years

against wishes of her family members, who are arrayed

as private respondents No.4 and 5 and such respondents are threatening to interfere in their marital life. Therefore, they be restrained from doing so. Of course Nehul Mor being aged less than 21 years, marriage between him and Nancy is in violation of Section 5 of the Hindu Marriage Act. Nevertheless protection is required to be granted to them so that they are not harmed physically by the private respondents.

Notice of motion for 29.04.2020.

In the meanwhile, respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Jind is directed to ensure that no physical harm is caused to the petitioners at hands of private respondents or persons claiming under them. However, this order shall not validate the marriage between the petitioners and shall not protect them from any civil or criminal action, to which they may be found liable.”

A detailed reply has been submitted by the State in which the statements of petitioners have been recorded, wherein, they have stated that they are not apprehending any danger or pressure and no type of police protection is required. The statement of the father of petitioner No.1 has also been recorded who has stated that he has no objection to the marriage of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has stated that in view of

the said reply and statements recorded, the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

Disposed of as infructuous.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

August 13, 2021.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.