

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

**CRWP No.5115 of 2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 04.06.2021**

Bhateri and another

....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present: Ms. Bhavna Grewal, Advocate for the petitioners.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

Heard through video conferencing.

This is a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking protection of life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent Nos.4 and 5.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are major and have got married against the wishes of their parents and relatives. Copies of the Aadhaar Cards of both the petitioners have been annexed with the petition as Annexures P-1 and P-2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners are receiving serious threats and apprehend grave danger to their life and liberty. The petitioners had also sent a representation dated 31.05.2021 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2 for providing adequate security. However, no action has been taken till date. The counsel for the petitioners would further contend that she limits her prayer in the present petition and would be satisfied at this stage if directions are issued for deciding the said representation in accordance with law.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajneesh Chadwal, AAG Haryana has joined the session through video conferencing and accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3. Since the matter is not being decided on merits, the service on other respondents is dispensed with.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed off with a direction to the Superintendent of Police, Jind (respondent No.2) to take a decision on the representation dated 31.05.2021 (Annexure P-4) in accordance with law and take necessary action as per law.

Since the age difference between petitioner No.1 and petitioner No.2 is of almost fifteen years, therefore, let the statement of petitioner No.1 also be got recorded by respondent No.2 separately, in the presence of a lady police officer, to ensure that she has not been forced into this relationship.

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.

Disposed off.

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

04.06.2021
Yogesh Sharma

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO