

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

107

CRWP-3066-2021

Decided on : 26.03.2021

Rama and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

(Through Video Conferencing)

PRESENT: Mr. Chander Shekhar Singhal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 3, to provide protection of life and liberty to the petitioners at the hands of respondent No.4.

The petitioners are seeking protection of their life and liberty as they are being threatened with dire consequences by respondent No.4, who is averse to their marriage, which was solemnized on 20th March, 2021. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are major and have solemnized their marriage of their own accord and despite representation 20th March, 2021 (Annexure P-5) having been given to respondent No.2 – the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, no action has been taken on the same. It has also been contended that petitioner No.1 was previously married and had obtained a divorce from her first husband through a member of Panchayat.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and gone through the representation (Annexure P-5) purportedly made to respondent No.2.

At the outset, it would be pertinent to observed that the divorce so

obtained by petitioner No.1 from her first husband has no sanctity in the eyes of law. Still further, a perusal of the representation (Annexure P-5) reveals that the allegations levelled by the petitioners *qua* the alleged threat perception therein are totally vague and bald, for which this Court would be most reluctant to issue any directions to respondent No.2 – the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, as neither is there any endorsement, postal or otherwise or any receipt with respect to the dispatch of the said representation nor is there any receipt of acknowledgment from the office of respondent No.2 - the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana. In the circumstances, the averments made in the petition and the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners do not inspire the confidence of this Court, which would warrant any issuance of directions to respondent No.2 – the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, to look into their representation (Annexure P-5).

Petition stands dismissed accordingly.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

March 26, 2021

J.Ram

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