

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

CRWP-3094-2021

Date of decision-26.03.2021

Binder Kaur and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Shubham Mehta, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

The writ petition has been filed under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of directions to the official respondent Nos.2 to 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and further for restraining the respondent Nos.5 to 9 from interfering in their peaceful life.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that Kamalpreet Kaur (petitioner No.2) is residing with Amarbir Singh (petitioner No.3) in live-in-relationship at the house of petitioner No.1 (mother of Amarbir Singh) and the private respondents, who are mother and other relatives of petitioner No.2 be restrained from interfering in the liberty and life of the petitioners. He submits that representation dated 22.03.2021 (Annexure P-3) was given to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar (Rural) by petitioner No.1,

however, the same has not been addressed till date and therefore, the interference from this Court is warranted. He has argued that petitioner No.1 is taking good care of daughter of respondent No.6, therefore, mother and other relatives of Komalpreet Kaur has no right to interfere in her peaceful life. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed that Komalpreet Kaur (petitioner No.2) is minor and respondent No.6 is her mother (natural guardian). Since, the minor is not represented by any guardian, therefore, the petition on her behalf is not maintainable, particularly when relief claimed is against her mother and other close relatives. The fact that petitioner No.2 is minor is not disputed as it is admitted by petitioner No.1 in her affidavit (Annexure P-4).

Apart from this, the representation given by petitioner No.1 does not indicate the existence of any actual threat to petitioner Nos.2 and 3, and relief prayed for is in the nature of seeking injunction.

Resultantly, no case is made out for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

26.03.2021

vanita

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