



108

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

**CRWP-7151-2024
DATE OF DECISION: 26.07.2024**

MANU @ ANU AND ANR ...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS ... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: None for the parties.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association has decided to abstain from work today i.e. 26.07.2024 on account of 'No Work Day' in view of the representation given by the District Bar Association Chandigarh, in which it was demanded by District Bar Association, Chandigarh to support the ongoing protest against Chandigarh Administration for sending the proposed draft of Chandigarh Union Territory Tenancy Act, 2019 to the Parliament Session for its notification.

2. This petition has been filed seeking protection of life and liberty of the petitioners by pleaded that both of them having attained the age of majority, have married each other against the wishes of their respective family members respondents No. 4 to 9 and to seek appropriate protection from the authorities. They submitted a representation dated 24.07.2024 (Annexure P-5), in this regard to the Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, but are still apprehensive about



CRWP-7151-2024

-2-

their security in view of the apparent inaction and alleged clout of their family members-respondents.

3. Both of them do appear to have crossed the age of majority as seen from the copies of documents filed and have married each other, in support of which, Marriage Certificate and marriage photographs (Annexures P-3 and P-4), have been placed on record.

4. For the aforesaid reasons, this appears to be a fit case for this Court to invoke the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. and in view of the mandate contained in Article 21 of the Constitution of India to protect the citizen's right to life and liberty.

5. Thus, the Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra is directed to consider the representation dated 24.07.2024 (Annexure P-5) and take appropriate steps to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

6. It is nevertheless clarified that this order is issued only on the premise that the petitioners have crossed the age of majority as seen from the documents placed on record being their Aadhar Cards as Annexures P-1 and P-2. This would not *ipso facto* amount to granting any seal of approval on the legality of their marriage which essentially would come in the domain of the concerned Matrimonial Courts. Further, they would not be entitled for any protection against their arrest or continuance of any criminal proceedings, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).

7. The petition is disposed of with the above directions.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

26.07.2024
anuradha

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No