

115

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

CRWP-3318-2021

Date of decision-07.04.2021

Pooja and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Virender Singh, 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 No.4, as petitioners have solemnized marriage on 01.04.2021 against his wishes.

The facts in brief leading to the writ petition are that the petitioners fell in love with each other and decided to marry, but private respondent No.4, who is father of petitioner No.1 was against their relationship as he wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of his own choice. On 01.04.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Shiv Durga Mandir, Sector-19, Panchkula and in this regard the photographs

(Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. After the ceremony, the petitioners informed respondent No.4 about their marriage, whereupon he extended threats to them. As per the pleadings, petitioners have apprehension that respondent No.4 will implicate them in a false case, therefore, they sent representation dated 02.04.2021 (Annexure P-5) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Mohali, but no action has been taken upon the same, so 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 No.4, therefore, they have apprehension that he would cause harm to them and despite a representation given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Mohali, the grievance of the petitioners has not been redressed. He prays for issuing necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that private respondent No.4 is resident of Kinnaur, which is situated at a far away place from the present place of residence of the petitioners, therefore, their stand that petitioners are unable to go to Police Station being afraid of respondent No.4 does not seem to be probable. Even otherwise, it is apprehended by petitioners that respondent No.4 may lodge a false case against the petitioners and even if he does so, it cannot be construed as threat, because the father is also

within his rights to avail the remedy in law.

Apart from it, the representation does not contain the necessary particulars relating to the alleged threat, therefore, the bald averments in the petition 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