

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

CRWP No.6113 of 2021
Date of Decision: 05.07.2021

Rohini and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Ms. Bhal Singh Beniwal, 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 6, upon the petitioners having married each other (as contended) against the wishes of the said respondents, on 28.06.2021.

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 enshrined in 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.

By way of proof of age, other than Aadhar Cards, Secondary School Certificates of both the petitioners have been annexed alongwith the petition, showing their dates of birth to be such as would make them above the legally marriageable age for females and males, both.

However, if upon actual verification, the age of the petitioners, especially petitioner no.1, is found to be below 18 years of age on the date of marriage, then this order will not bar proceedings under the provisions of that Act, all offences punishable under the provisions of the said 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.

July 05, 2021
dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No