

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

CRWP-3203-2021

Date of decision-05.04.2021

Balwinder Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Mikhail Kad, 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 7, as they have solemnized marriage on 30.03.2021 against their 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, private respondents who are parents and cousins of petitioners No.1, respectively were against their relationship. Therefore, on 30.03.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Gurudwara Sahib Atarsar Sahib, District Sangrur as per Sikh rites. As per the pleadings, after the marriage of the petitioners, they are receiving threats from respondent Nos.4 to 7. He has invited the attention of the Court to Annexure P-4 to contend that a representation dated 30.03.2021 has

already been filed to to Senior Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad, however, till date no action has been taken 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 30.03.2021 (Annexure P-4), was sent to respondent No.2 through postal receipt dated 30.03.2021 and the petition was filed on the very next day i.e 31.03.2021.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that admittedly, the representation sent by the petitioners did not even reach the office of Senior Superintendent of Police, but the petitioners filed the petition on the next day. It is evident that no time was given to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad (respondent No.2) to consider the grievance of the petitioners for redressal. Apart from it, the representation submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.2 also lacks material particulars and 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

05.04.2021

vanita

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