

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

**CRWP-3477-2021**

**Date of decision-09.04.2021**

**Tripta Devi and another**

**...Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**State of Haryana and others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ**

Present: Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, 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 5 to protect their life and liberty from respondent Nos.6 and 7, as they have solemnized marriage on 06.04.2021 against their wishes and further restraining them from interfering in their peaceful life.

During the course of hearing it is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners that the alleged love affair of the petitioners was about four years old when they decided to marry against wishes of private respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has stated that on the date of marriage i.e. 06.04.2021, petitioner No.1 was threatened by private respondents (parents of petitioner No.1) to not to marry petitioner No.2, but she accompanied petitioner No.2 & left her house and solemnized marriage on 06.04.2021. He submits that on the same day, the representation dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-3) was sent to the Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, but till date no action has

been taken upon the same by the Police. He prays that necessary directions be issued.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the case set up by the petitioners is absolutely misconceived as admittedly no complaint was ever made by petitioner No.1 when the parents opposed their love affair. Not only this, the petitioner No.1 was not even restrained by private respondents, when she left her house with petitioner No.2 to marry him.

Above all, representation dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-3) was sent through the friend to the office of Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, however, there is no averment in the petition about the particulars of the said friend and when the representation was submitted before the officer. Even otherwise, it is evident that no time was given to the Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra (respondent No.2) to consider the grievance of the petitioners for redressal, as the petition was filed on the very same day i.e 06.04.2021 after submission of representation.

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

**(MANOJ BAJAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**09.04.2021**

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :  
Whether Reportable :

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
| Yes | No |