

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

CRWP-3425-2021

Date of decision-08.04.2021

Harpreet Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others **...Respondents**

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Arun Kumar Gupta, 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 7, as they have solemnized marriage on 05.04.2021 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners fell in love with each other two years back and decided to marry. When the relationship of the petitioners came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are parents and brothers of petitioner No.1 respectively, they opposed their relationship. The petitioners ran away from their respective houses and solemnized marriage on 05.04.2021 at Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir, MDC, Sector-6, Panchkula. As per the pleadings, private respondents threatened petitioners of dire consequences and therefore, they sent representation dated 05.04.2021 (Annexure P-4) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar (Rural), but no action has been taken upon the same, so they have approached this Court with a prayer to provide them protection.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that marriage was performed on 05.04.2021 and thereafter, the petitioners sent representation on 05.04.2021 by private courier service to respondent No.2.

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 Senior Superintendent of Police, but the petitioners filed the petition on the next day i.e. 06.04.2021. It is evident that representation by petitioners sent to respondent No.2 was not even received by the said officer when this petition was filed and the respondent No.2 had no occasion to consider the grievance of the petitioners for redressal. In this background, the petition is not maintainable.

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 and renders the claim of the petitioners doubtful.

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

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

08.04.2021

vanita

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