

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

117

CRWP No.5956 of 2021
Date of Decision: 01.07.2021

Vipin Kumar and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Jaswal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard by video conferencing.

By this petition, the petitioners seek protection of life and liberty at the hands of respondents no.4 to 7, upon the petitioners having married each other (as contended) against the wishes of the said respondents, on 29.06.2021.

On a specific query put to learned counsel for the petitioners, it has been stated that neither are the petitioners in any prohibited relationship to each other, nor has any of them been married earlier. He states that he has obtained specific instructions from the petitioners in that regard.

Consequently, since protection of life and liberty is a fundamental right of every citizen under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, without making any comment whatsoever on the validity of the marriage, or otherwise, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents no.2 and 3, to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not put to any harm or threat at the hands of the

aforesaid respondents, or at their behest.

There is no firm proof of age of either of the petitioners other than their Aadhar Cards, which is actually not a firm proof of age.

Thus, if any of the petitioners are found to be actually below marriageable age in terms of the provisions of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, this order shall not be construed to be a bar on any proceedings initiated under that Act, offences committed under the provisions of that Act being cognizable in terms of Section 15 thereof.

Further, it is made clear that if any of the averments made in the petition is found to be incorrect, specifically with regard to either the petitioners being in any prohibited relationship to each other, or as regards their previous marital status, this order shall not be construed to be a bar on proceedings initiated as per law.

Though notice of motion had not been issued in this case, Mr. V.S. Mahal, learned PP, U.T. Chandigarh, appears for respondents no.1 to 3 on advance notice received by him and submits that the petitioners in fact were not found to be living at the address given in the memo of parties as per SI Malkeet Singh who has instructed him in the matter, but if they approach the police authority, naturally, they would be granted protection as per law.

July 01, 2021
dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No