

**(2017) 06 P&H CK 0036**  
**In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh**  
**Case No : M-21962 of 2017**

Pooja Yadav and another

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Haryana and others

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 14-06-2017

**Acts Referred:**

<a href=3998>Constitution of India</a>, <a href=3998-21>Article 21</a> -  
Amendment of the Schedule

**Citation :** (2017) 06 P&H CK 0036

**Hon'ble Judges :** Amol Rattan Singh

**Bench :** SINGLE BENCH

**Advocate :** K.S. Brar

---

## Judgement

1. The petitioners, who are present in the court, are seeking protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of respondents No.4 to 9, who are stated to be parents and other immediate relatives of petitioner No.1, on account of the fact that they have married each other of their own free will, against the wishes of the said respondents on 12.06.2017. Photographs of what is stated to be a marriage ceremony have been annexed with the petition.
2. As regards proof of age of petitioner No.1, her original Aadhar Card, issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India, showing her date of birth to be 13.03.1994, and as regards proof of age of petitioner No.2, his original Identity Card, issued by the Election Commission of India, showing his date of birth to be of the year 1992, have been produced in Court.

3. On a specific query put to learned counsel for the petitioners, it has been stated that neither are the petitioners in any prohibited relationship to each other, nor has any of them been married earlier.

4. Consequently, since protection of life and liberty is a fundamental right of every citizen under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not put to any harm or threat at the hands of the aforesaid respondents or at their behest.

5. However, it is made clear that if any of the averments made in the petition is found to be incorrect, specifically with regard to either the petitioners being in any prohibited relationship to each other, or as regards their previous marital status, or with regard to their age, this order shall not be construed to be a bar on proceedings initiated as per law.