

117

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

CRWP-3320-2021

Date of decision-07.04.2021

Sarika Vinod Pandya and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Sunny Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India, petitioners seek a writ of mandamus by way of direction to official respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from respondent Nos.4 to 7, as petitioners have solemnized marriage against their wishes.

As per the averments in the petition, the petitioners fell in love with each other two years back and when their relation came in the knowledge of the private respondent Nos.4 to 7 (all residents of Bangalore, State of Karnataka), they turned against their relationship. The petitioners decided and got married on 01.04.2021 and in this regard the photographs (Annexure P-3) are appended with the petition.

After the ceremony, the petitioners telephonically informed private respondent Nos.4 to 7 about their marriage, whereupon they extended threats to them. The petitioners sent representation dated 01.04.2021 (Annexure P-4) by post to Commissioner of Police, Amritsar and as no action has been taken upon the same, they have approached this Court with a prayer to provide them protection.

Learned counsel has argued that as the petitioners have performed marriage against the wishes of the private respondent Nos.4 to 7, therefore, they have apprehension that they would cause harm to them and despite a representation given to Commissioner of Police, Amritsar the grievance of the petitioners has not been redressed. He prays for issuing necessary directions.

After hearing learned counsel, this Court finds that as per the averments in the petition, the petitioners were residing and working at Bangalore when they came in touch with each other and their relationship is two years old, which was in the knowledge of the private respondents. There is no material on record that previously any complaint was ever made by the petitioners against the private respondents who opposed their relationship and the present representation is also vague as it does not contain the necessary particulars relating to the alleged threat. It needs to be noticed here that the representation (Annexure P-4) is identical to the representation filed

by petitioners in CRWP-3319-2021, who also claimed protection on similar grounds and the only change is names of applicants and private respondents, whereas rest of the contents of the representations are word by word same. It is apparent that the grievance expressed by the petitioners does not appear to be genuine.

Apart from it, presently petitioners are residing at Amritsar, whereas respondents are residents of Bangalore and the apprehension expressed by the petitioners is not convincing. The writ petition as well as the representation dated 01.04.2021 contain bald averments and the same are not enough for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

07.04.2021

vanita

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