

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

CRWP-10105-2020

Date of decision-04.12.2020

Kunal and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Gaurav Chadda, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Through this writ petition, the petitioners are praying for a writ of mandamus by way of directions to the respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty and further for restraining the respondent Nos.4 to 9 from interfering in their peaceful life.

The facts in brief leading to the writ petition are that the petitioners fell in love and decided to live together in relationship and when the decision was expressed to the parents of petitioner No.2, same was not accepted by respondent Nos.4 to 9. It was further pleaded that parents of petitioner No.2 wanted to marry her against her wishes, therefore, she ran away from her house and presently she is residing with petitioner No.1. The private respondents extended threats to the petitioners, therefore, they gave representation dated 10.09.2020/01.12.2020 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2, but no action has been taken on the same. The petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary directions.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that petitioners are major, who are in live in relationship, and the action of the respondent Nos.4 to 9 in interfering their life is in violation of Constitutional

rights and therefore, petitioners deserve the protection. He submits that the petitioners are facing threats at the hands of private respondents and though in this regard a representation was 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.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that respondent Nos.4 and 5 are natural guardians of petitioner No.2. The petition is founded on bald averments and is not supported by any convincing material. Apart from it, the representation submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.2 does not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners.

In view of the above, this Court does not find any reason to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction as the petition is nothing, but abuse of process of the law, therefore, the petitioner No.1 deserves to be burdened with costs.

Resultantly, the petition is dismissed with costs of Rs.25,000/- to be deposited with Director, PGIMER, Chandigarh.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

04.12.2020

vanita

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