

116

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3319-2021

Date of decision-07.04.2021

Priya and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, 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 6, as they have solemnized marriage on 030.03.2021 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners are known to each other for the last three years, who fell in love and decided to marry. According to him, the alliance of the petitioners being inter-religion was opposed by private respondents, who are father and brothers of Priya (petitioner No.1) and therefore, on 29.03.2021, petitioners ran away from their respective houses and solemnized marriage on 30.03.2021 according to Sikh Rites at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Dasvi, Kharar. As per the pleadings, after the marriage of the petitioners, they are receiving threats from respondent Nos.4 to 6. He has invited the attention of the Court to Annexure P-5 to contend that a representation dated

30.03.2021 has already been filed to Senior Superintendent of Police,Tarn Taran, however, till date no action has been taken by the said officer. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners and perusing the representation, this Court finds that 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 manner and mode of alleged threat. It needs to be noticed here that the representation (Annexure P-5) is identical to the representation filed by petitioners in CRWP-3320-2021, 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.

The averments made in the petition do not inspire any confidence, therefore, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

07.04.2021

vanita

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