

119

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-1780-2021

Date of Decision: 25.02.2021

Pratishtha and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Ms. Veenus Malik, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Jindal, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Articles 226 Constitution of India, petitioners have prayed for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty, as they have solemnized marriage on 17.02.2021 against the wishes of private respondent No.4.

As per pleadings, the petitioners are receiving threats from private respondent No.4, as they have solemnized marriage on 17.02.2021 against his wishes. He has drawn the attention of the Court to the representation dated 17.02.2021 (Annexure P-5) submitted by petitioners to Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra and contended that no action has been taken by the officer so far. She prays for issuance of necessary directions.

Parties are present in the Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that pursuant to

the order dated 22.02.2021 the parties met with each other and petitioner No.1 refused to accompany her parents, but it is apprehended that the private respondent No.4 may cause harm to the petitioners, as they have entered into marriage against his wishes. She has invited the attention of the Court to the representation dated 17.02.2021, wherein it is mentioned that the petitioners solemnized marriage on 17.02.2021 at Panchkula and thereafter, submitted the representation to Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra on the same day.

A perusal of the petition further reveals that it was prepared on the same day with an affidavit of the petitioners. The sequence of events pleaded by the petitioners in their petition do not seem to be probable and it is apparent that the petitioners have filed this writ petition hastily, without even waiting for any action on their representation. Therefore, the prayer made by the learned counsel for issuance of directions to Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra to look into their representation is also not worth acceptance. Even otherwise, the father of the girl, who is present in Court does not seem to be a kind of person, who would cause harm to the petitioners and apparently, this petition is founded on baseless apprehensions.

Resultantly, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

25.02.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes No
Yes No