

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

116

CRWP-9673-2021
Date of Decision: 11.10.2021

Gagandeep Kaur Hundal and another Petitioners

Versus

The State of Punjab and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Amritpal Singh Sohal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

By this petition, the petitioners seek protection of life and liberty at the hands of respondents no.4 and 5, upon the petitioners having married each other (as contended) against the wishes of the said respondents, on 06.10.2021.

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.

As regards the age of petitioner no.1, a copy of her passport has been annexed as Annexure P-1 with the petition, showing her date of birth to be 19.06.1997, thereby making her more than 24 years of age.

As regards petitioner no.2, since there is no firm proof of his age other than his Aadhar Card, which is actually not a firm proof of age, if he is found to be below the 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 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.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

11.10.2021
adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No