

117

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

CRWP-181-2021

Date of decision-08.01.2021

Ravita

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Tarun Dhingra, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner has filed this writ petition under Article 226/227 Constitution of India and prays for issuance of a writ of mandamus by issuing directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect her life and personal liberty as she is being harassed and humiliated by private respondent Nos.4 to 7.

Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner was engaged with respondent No.6 on 20.09.2020 and despite her refusal to marry him, her father and uncle (respondent Nos.4 and 5, respectively) performed her marriage with respondent No.6, on 04.12.2020. He has invited the attention of the Court to the representation dated 24.12.2020 (Annexure P-2) submitted to the Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra and contended that no action has been taken so far by respondent No.2. It was alleged in the representation that her father took her to Hisar and pressurized her to marry with respondent No.6, who also physically assaulted her on 15.12.2020. Her sister-in-law (respondent No.7) also threatened the petitioner. As per the

representation, she has apprehension that the petitioner would be kidnapped by the private respondents. He prays that necessary directions be issued to the official respondents.

After hearing learned counsel, this Court finds that the petitioner has levelled allegations not only against her own father and uncle, but has also blamed her husband and his sister. The marriage of the petitioner was allegedly performed on 04.12.2020 by use of force, but there is no averment in the petition that any steps were taken by her for dissolving the marriage. The petition is founded on bald averments as no supportive material has been placed on record and the photographs of injuries allegedly suffered by the petitioner are also not substantiated by any medico legal report. The averments in the petition being vague and lacking in material particulars are not enough for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

January 08, 2021
vanita

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