

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

CRWP-1328-2021

Date of decision-11.02.2021

Rahul Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Mohan Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

By means of this writ petition under Articles 226/227 Constitution of India, petitioners have prayed for issuance of directions to official respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty as they are facing threats at the instance of respondent Nos.4 and 5.

The facts in brief leading to the writ petition are that for the last one year and six months, petitioners came in contact through social media. Thereafter, they met and fell in love and decided to marry each other. As per the pleadings, when the relationship of the petitioners came to the knowledge of private respondents (parents of petitioner No.2), they turned against their alliance and they compelled petitioner No.2 to marry with some other person against her wishes. Therefore, petitioners ran away from their respective house and now residing together. They apprehend that the private respondents would cause harm to them, so they submitted a representation

dated 27.01.2021 (Annexure P-3) to Superintendent of Police, District Fatehabad, however, till date no action has been taken by the said officer. Hence this writ petition.

Learned counsel contends that petitioners are major and have decided to marry each other, but as the parents of the petitioner No.2 are against this alliance, therefore, they are apprehending threat to their life. He has further contended that the parents of the petitioner No.2 were compelling her for marriage with a person of their choice, so they both ran away and started residing together. He submits that the grievance of the petitioners conveyed through the representation to respondent No.2 has not been addressed so far, therefore, the necessary directions be issued by providing protection to the petitioners.

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.

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

11.02.2021

vanita

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