

109

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-10475-2021

Date of Decision: 3.11.2021

Anuj and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Ms. Suman Kumari, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.

(Through Video-conferencing)

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

The present Criminal Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for directing respondent No.2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

It is the case of the petitioners that they both are major inasmuch as petitioner No.1 was born on 21.5.2001 as is apparent from Aadhaar Card (Annexure P-1) and petitioner No.2 was born on 03.07.1998 as is apparent from Aadhaar Card (Annexure P-2) and have married each other on 28.10.2021, with their free consent and without any pressure and that this is their first marriage. Reliance has been placed upon the marriage Certificate

and photographs (Annexure P-3 and P-4). It is also stated by learned counsel for the petitioners that a detailed representation dated 01.11.2021 (Annexure P-5) has also been given to respondent No.2 with regard to the same.

Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 3 only.

On advance notice, Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and on a specific query put by this Court, he has stated that he has no objection in case, respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, looks into the representation dated 01.11.2021 (Annexure P-5) and takes appropriate action in accordance with law.

After considering the abovesaid facts and without commenting upon the legality of the marriage and expressing any opinion on merits of the case, the present Criminal Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2 to look into the representation dated 01.11.2021 (Annexure P-5) and after considering the threat perception to the petitioners, respondent No.2 will take appropriate action in accordance with law.

It is, however, clarified that this order shall not debar the State from proceeding against the petitioners, if involved in any other case.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

03.11.2021
geeta

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No