

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

**116**

**CRWP-9599-2021**

Date of Decision: October 07, 2021

**ADITIYA BHAGOTRA AND ANOTHER**

... Petitioners

***VERSUS***

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present : Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**Through Video Conferencing**

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI. J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioner No.1 is 24 years of age and is of marriageable age, whereas petitioner No.2 is more than 17 years and 10 months and is short of only one and a half month for attaining the age of marriage i.e. 18 years. He has submitted that due to the circumstances and the threats from the family, they have got married with each other and since she is short of only one and a half month, the petitioners may be protected with regard to their lives. He submitted that a representation dated 05.10.2021 was filed vide Annexure P-7, which has not been considered by the Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar i.e. respondent No.2. He submitted that the scope of the present petition is confined only to the extent of protection of their lives.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to3 only.

Mr. R.S. Thind, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents No.1 to 3 and states that he has no objection in case the representation (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioners is considered and decided in accordance with law.

I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

The scope of the present petition is confined only to the protection of the lives of the petitioners.

In view of the above, it is directed that the Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar i.e. the respondent No.2 shall look into the representation (Annexure P-7) and to take further action with regard to ensuring the protection of lives of the petitioners in accordance with law.

It is made clear that this order does not reflect anything on the *inter-se* relationship between the petitioners or upon the validity of their marriage.

It is further made clear that this order shall not become an impediment to proceed against the petitioners either under the Child Marriage Prohibition Act or under any other law for the time being in force, if it is so required.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)  
JUDGE

October 07, 2021  
*rajender*

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | : | Yes/No |