

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

CRWP-2573-2021

Date of decision-23.03.2021

Kawaljeet Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Rajeev Kumar Sharma, 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 from respondent Nos.4 to 6, as they have solemnized marriage on 11.03.2021 against his wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners are known to each other, who fell in love and decided to marry. However, respondent Nos. 4 to 6, who are parents and brother of petitioner No.1 were against their relationship. On 11.03.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Dassvi, Village Singha Devi, Tehsil Kharar, District Mohali, as per Sikh rites. As per the pleadings, after the marriage of the petitioners, they are receiving threats from private respondents. He has invited the attention of the Court to Annexure P-4 to contend that a representation dated 11.03.2021 has already been given to Superintendent of Police, Amritsar Rural, however, till date no action has been taken upon the said request by the said officer. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the representation dated 11.03.2021 (Annexure P-4), was sent to respondent No.2 through post/courier dated 11.03.2021 and the petition was also filed on the next day. The postal/courier receipt is produced before the Court and the same are taken on record.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that even the representation filed by the petitioners did not reach the office of respondent No.2 and the petitioners filed the petition on the next day and no time was given to the authority for redressal of their grievance. 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

23.03.2021

vanita

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