

Date of Decision : 25.10.2021

...Petitioners

## Versus

## ....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : Mr. Chander Shekhar Singhal, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*

**B.S. Walia, J. (VC)**

1. Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

2. Prayer in the Criminal Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is for directing respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 9, as also for directing respondent Nos.2 to 3 not to interfere in the matrimonial life of the petitioners at the behest of respondent Nos.4 to 9.

3. Learned counsel contends that the petitioners fulfill all the conditions stipulated under law so as to entitle them to get married, petitioners are major as petitioner No.1 is 24 years of age as is evident from Certificate (Annexure P/1) dated 14.05.2010, as also Aadhar Card (Annexure P-2), wherein her date of birth is recorded as 09.09.1996, while petitioner No.2 is 34 years of age as is evident from his matriculation certificate (Annexure P/3) dated 26.11.2001 besides Aadhar Card in which his date of birth is recorded as 05.02.1987. Learned counsel contends that on account of

mutual liking for each other, the petitioners got married as is evident from marriage certificate, Annexure P/5 dated 19.10.2021, as well as photographs of marriage (Annexure P/6), without any fraud, force, pressure, coercion or undue influence, though against the wishes of respondent Nos.4 to 9 who are threatening them with harm to their life and liberty, therefore, the petitioners submitted representation Annexure P/7 dated 19.10.2021 to respondent No.2 i.e. The Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar, Haryana, seeking protection of their life and liberty but no action has been taken in respect thereto till date and that in the circumstances, the instant petition.

Learned counsel further contends that the petitioners would be satisfied, if the petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.2 to consider and decide representation (Annexure P/7) dated 19.10.2021 in accordance with law, in a time bound manner and to provide protection to them.

4. Notice of motion to respondent No.2 only.

5. Mr. Naveen Kumar Sheoran, DAG, Haryana, who is present, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and on perusal of the petition states that he has no objection to the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, in view of the decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Lata Singh vs. State of UP and others, JT 2006 (6) SC, 173** but without commenting upon the age of the petitioners, validity of their marriage or the authenticity of the documents attached with the petition, the petition is *disposed of* by directing respondent No.2 i.e. The Superintendent

of Police, Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar, Haryana, to decide representation (Annexure P/7) dated 19.10.2021, submitted by the petitioners in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and take such action in respect thereto as may be warranted keeping in view the threat perception to the petitioners. However, it is made clear that this order shall not bar any civil or criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners in accordance with law.

**(B.S. Walia)**  
**Judge**

**25.10.2021**  
*'Rajneesh'*

*Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*