

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

CRWP-3202-2021

Date of decision-05.04.2021

Kavita and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

U.T.Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Rajat Garg, 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.1 to 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.

The facts in brief leading to the petition are that petitioners were having a love affair for the last two years and they decided to marry. When the relationship of the petitioners came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are father, brother and other relative of petitioner No.1 respectively, they turned against their relationship and threatened them to kill. Therefore, petitioners ran away from their respective houses and solemnized marriage on 30.03.2021 according to Hindu Rites at Pracheen Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir, Sector-6, Panchkula. It is pleaded in the petition that private respondents are

extending threats to them after their marriage and petitioners apprehend that the private respondents would cause harm to them, so they submitted a representation dated 30.03.2021 (Annexure P-7) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh, however, till date no action has been taken by the said officer. Hence this writ petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioners being major have solemnized marriage, but are facing threats from private respondent Nos.4 to 7, therefore, petitioners deserve the protection. He submits that a representation was given to the respondent No.2, however, the same has not been looked into so far, therefore, the petitioners have approached this Court to seek protection of their life and liberty. 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-7), 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 Superintendent of Police, but the petitioners filed the petition on the next day. It is evident that no time was given to the Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh (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