

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

**CRWP No. 2003 of 2021
Date of Decision: 26.02.2021**

Vidisha Goyal and another

Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Bhupender Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. G. S. Goraya, Advocate for respondents No. 4 to 6.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

This petition is filed seeking direction to Superintendent of Police, Karnal and Station House Officer, Police Station Taraori, District Karnal to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners who have married against the wishes of their parents.

The facts pleaded are that the petitioners are in a live-in relationship and there is threat perception from the parents of petitioner No.1. A representation for protection of life and liberty was moved to the Superintendent of Police, Karnal on 24.2.2021. It would be relevant to mention here that there is no proof that such representation was ever submitted.

Learned counsel for the State, appearing on advance notice, submits that FIR No. 68 dated 23.2.2021 was registered at Police Station

Taraori at the behest of uncle of petitioner No. 1. This petition is only an attempt to ensure that police proceedings are not taken against petitioner No. 2.

Mr. G. S. Goraya, Advocate puts in appearance on behalf of respondents No. 4 to 6, i.e. parents and brother of petitioner No. 1. He submits that there is no threat perception to the petitioners from his client.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that parents of petitioner No. 2 are in police custody and there is an apprehension that petitioner No. 2 may also be arrested.

The facts alleged have not been pleaded in the petition. It was specifically put to learned counsel for the petitioners that there is an individual cause of action for both the petitioners to approach the police authorities or the court for protection of their life and liberty and specific facts be pleaded for that. Learned counsel for the petitioners rather than availing opportunity, relied upon the orders of this Court passed in CRWP-7911 of 2020 –Divya v. State of Punjab and others, decided on 9.10.2020 and CRWP No. 691 of 2021—Mafi and another v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 25.1.2021 to state that directions be issued in present case to decide the representation.

Considering that apart from bald statement in the petition, there is not even a iota of evidence before the Court regarding threat from private respondents. Moreover, a statement is made by learned counsel for the private respondents that there is no threat from his clients.

The orders relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioners does not enhance the case of the petitioner. In the present case, no basis is

made for threat apprehension to the life and liberty of the petitioners.
Contention of State counsel appears to be Court correct that petition is only
for purpose of stalling the proceedings in the FIR.

The petition is dismissed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

26th February, 2021
mk

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes |