

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

CRWP-3428-2021

Date of decision-08.04.2021

Anjli and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Jagjeet Singh, 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 06.04.2021 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners fell in love with each other and decided to marry. However, private respondents, who are parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1, respectively, opposed their relationship as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. Therefore, on 06.04.2021 petitioners solemnized marriage at Pracheen Pashupati Nath, Shiv Mander, M.D.C, Sector-6, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. In this regard the photographs (Anenxure P-4) are appended with the petition. As per the pleadings, petitioners have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, they

sent representation dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-5) to Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, but no action has been taken upon the same, so they have approached this Court with a prayer to provide them protection. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the representation dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-5), was sent to respondent No.2 and the petition was filed on the very next day i.e 07.04.2021.

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 Superintendent of Police, but the petitioners filed the petition on the very next day. It is evident that no time was given to the Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar (respondent No.2) to consider the grievance of the petitioners for redressal. 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.

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