

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

CRWP-6965-2020

Date of decision-09.09.2020

Poonam Rani and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Nitin Mittoo, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

By means of this writ petition, the petitioners have prayed for a writ of mandamus by issuing directions to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty as they apprehend danger at the hands of private respondent Nos.4 to 6.

Briefly, the facts as pleaded in the writ petition are that Poonam Rani (petitioner No.1) alongwith her minor son was deserted by her husband three years back, and later on their marriage was dissolved mutually through Panchayat. Since then, she was residing alongwith her child without any help and for the last six months, she came in contact with petitioner No.2, namely, Ajay Kumar who is unmarried and taking care of her. According to the pleadings, petitioners decided to live together, but their relatives turned against their alliance. The petitioners apprehended that the private respondents would cause harm to them, therefore, they submitted a representation dated 26.08.2020 (Annexure P-3) to Superintendent of Police, Hoshiarpur, whereupon no action has been taken. Hence this writ petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioners being in love are living together, but are facing threats at the hands of private

(brother in-law of petitioner No.1). It is pointed out that the petitioner No.1 was already married but marriage was dissolved by way of Panchayati divorce. He submits that the petitioners are facing threats at the hands of parents of petitioner No.1.

He further submits that the representation was also given to the respondent No.2, however, the same has not been looked into so far, therefore, the petitioners have approached this Court to seek protection of their life and liberty. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the stand of petitioner No.1 is not substantiated with any material. There is nothing on record to indicate that marriage of petitioner No.1 was dissolved. Even the particulars of the husband have not been mentioned in the petition. A perusal of the representation reveals that she has leveled bald allegations against her own parents and the same do not inspire confidence.

In view of the above, this Court does not find any reason to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction and the petition is dismissed with costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with District Legal Services Authority, Hoshiarpur.

Chief Judicial Magistrate, Hoshiarpur shall ensure the recovery and deposit of the costs.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

09.09.2020
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No