

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr.No.112

CRWP No.6545 of 2022

Date of Decision:11th July, 2022.

Anju Bala & Another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. Dig Vijay Nagpal Advocate for
Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

By way of the instant petition, both the petitioners seek the indulgence of this Court for the issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehend threat to the same at the hands of respondents No.4 to 7 because they (petitioners) have solemnized their marriage against the wishes of these respondents. It has also been mentioned in this petition that a representation (Annexure P-4) has already been moved to respondent No.2 in this regard.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who has appeared on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case in pursuance of the copies of the instant petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance, accepts the notice on behalf of these respondents.

Heard.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners restricts his prayer to the issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 to look into and take appropriate action on the said representation of the petitioners, i.e. Annexure P-4.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

It is pertinent to mention here that in Annexure P-2, i.e the copy of the Aadhar Card of petitioner No.2-Naveen Kumar, the year of his birth has been recorded as '2001' without mentioning the exact date and month in the same so as to ascertain as to whether he (petitioner No.2) has completed the age of 21 years or not.

However, keeping in view the intent of the fundamental right as enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India which ensures the protection of life and liberty to the citizens as well as the above-discussed limited prayer as made by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the legality and validity of the marriage as stated to have been solemnized between the petitioners, respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Shri Muktsar Sahib, is hereby directed to look into the said representation (Annexure P-4) of the petitioners and if it is found that the petitioners genuinely deserve any protection, then to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

It is further clarified that this order shall not be construed to be a shield to the petitioners against any action/proceedings already initiated or intended/contemplated to be initiated against them by any competent authority/person on account of their said marriage and permissible under any

relevant provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

11.07.2022.
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes
Whether Reportable?	No