

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

117

**CRWP-4991-2021
Date of Decision:02.06.2021**

KARAN AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF U.T. CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS ...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Abhiraj Singh Baweja, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Shashank Bhandari, APP, U.T. Chandigarh.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

The Court has been convened through video conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

Karan son of Bachittar Singh (petitioner No.1) claims to be 20 years and Simranjeet Kaur (petitioner No.2) wife of Karan claims to be 21 years of age. Petitioner No.1 is not of marriageable age, though he claims to have married with petitioner No.2. They have pleaded that they have married against the wishes of respondents no.5 and 6 and seek protection of their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.5 and 6. They have placed on record Marriage Certificate, Annexure P-1, and photographs, Annexure P-2, evidencing their marriage. They have also placed on record Adhar Cards as Annexures P-4 and P-5. The petitioners have submitted a representation, Annexure P-3 to the Senior Superintendent of Police, U.T., Chandigarh.

Counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgment of this Court passed by a Division Bench in LPA No.385 of 2016 titled as **Elaichi and another vs. State of Punjab and others**, decided on 16.05.2016 and a judgment of Co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed in CWP No.17069 of 2019 titled as **Kawaljeet Kaur and another vs. State of Punjab** and others, decided on 24.06.2019 to submit that even though boy was not of marriageable age, this Court had entertained their petitions for protection of their life and liberty.

Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with directions to respondent No.2 to decide the representation of the petitioners, Annexure P-3 and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived.

It is clarified that this order shall not be treated as a stamp of this Court for the marriage of the petitioners.

02.06.2021
sheetal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No