CRM-M 20450 of 2013

# IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

### CRM-M 20450 of 2013 Date of Decision: 28.06.2013

Ruby Rani and another		
	Versus	Petitioners
State of Punjab & others		
		Respondents

## \*\*\*\*

### CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

- 1. To be referred to the reporters or not?
- 2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest.

#### RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

- 1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for directing respondents No.1 to 3 to grant security to the petitioners against the imminent danger and threat of elimination from respondents No.4 and 5.
- 2. It has been pleaded that the petitioner No.1 is major and her date of birth is 12.12.1991 and the date of birth of petitioner No.2 is 07.01.1984 as per the Aadhar Cards (Annexures P-1 & P-2). It has been averred that the petitioners have got married on 26.06.2013 and the copy of marriage certificate and the photographs are appended as Annexures P-3 and P-4. The said marriage is opposed by the private

CRM-M 20450 of 2013 2

respondent and they had given a representation dated 26.06.2013 (Annexure P-5) to the Senior Superintendent of Police (Rural), Amritsar respondent No.2 with a prayer to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

- 3. After hearing counsel for the parties and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case or the validity of the marriage and the age of the petitioners and keeping in view the binding precedent of the Supreme Court in **Lata**Singh v. State of U.P. and another (2006)2 SCC (Criminal)

  478, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to look into the matter and take necessary action in accordance with law and provide protection, if required.
- 4. This order, however, shall not be construed to mean that the petitioners were of marriageable age at the time of their marriage or that the marriage is legal as per laws applicable to the parties. This order is not intended to put the imprimatur of this Court on the validity of marriage and is limited to protection of the personal liberty of citizens protected under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.
- 5. Petition stands disposed of.

**28.06.2013**Paritosh Kumar

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA) JUDGE