

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

**CRWP No.4279 of 2021
Date of Decision: 12.05.2021**

Gurmeet Kaur and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. Gurpreet Jayia, Advocate,
for the Petitioners.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA J. (ORAL)

Both the Petitioners seek protection of their life and liberty by contending that both of them having attained the age of majority, having married each other against the wishes of their respective family members respondent Nos.4 to 7, and so seek appropriate protection from the authorities. They submitted a representation (Annexure P-7) in this regard to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ferozepur on 28.04.2021, but are still apprehensive about their security in view of the apparent inaction and alleged clout of their family members-respondents.

2. Both of them have married, each other in support of which, Marriage Photographs (Annexures P-6) have been placed on record.

3. For the aforesaid reasons, this appears to be a fit case for this Court to invoke the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. and in view of the mandate contained in Article 21 of the Constitution of India to

protect the citizen's right to life and liberty.

4. Thus the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ferozepur is directed to consider the representation dated 28.04.2021 (Annexure P-7) and take appropriate steps to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

5. It is nevertheless clarified that this order is issued only on the premise that though, as per Aadhar Cards, the Petitioners have crossed the age of majority, yet Petitioner No.2, namely Karan Singh has not completed 21 years of age and is presently 19 years and 06 months old, as seen from the document placed on record being his Aadhaar Card. The Petitioners have not produced on record a copy of their marriage certificate. However, Petitioner No.1 has appended an affidavit dated 29.04.2021 in support of her marriage with Petitioner No.2. This would not *ipso facto* amount to granting any seal of approval on the legality of their marriage which essentially would come in the domain of the concerned Matrimonial Courts. Further, they would not be entitled for any protection against their arrest or continuance of any criminal proceedings, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).

6. The petition is disposed off with the above direction.

May 12, 2021
Apurva

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No