

116

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

CRWP-3417-2021

Date of decision-08.04.2021

Krishan Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr.Sukhmeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

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 Nos.4 to 7 as they are living in live-in-relationship and further restraining them from registering FIR against them.

As per the facts pleaded in the petition, petitioners being known to each other through facebook from the last year one year, fell in love and decided to marry each other on attaining the marriageable age, but when their relationship came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are parents and other relatives of petitioner No.2, same was not accepted by them. They gave beatings to petitioner No.2

and decided to marry her with a boy of their own choice. Due to fear, petitioner No.2 ran away from her house on 28.03.2021, and now living with petitioner No.1 in his house. The private respondents who are respective parents and other relatives petitioner No.2, extended threats to the petitioners that they will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated 03.04.2021 (Annexure P-3) was given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Faridkot, but no action has been taken on the same. The petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary directions.

Learned counsel contends that petitioners are major and have decided to marry each other, but as the parents of the petitioner No.2 are against this alliance, therefore, they are apprehending threat to their life. He has further contended that the parents of the petitioner No.2 were compelling her for marriage with a person of their choice, so petitioner No.2 ran away and started residing with petitioner No.1. He submits that the grievance of the petitioners conveyed through the representation to respondent No.2 has not been addressed so far, therefore, the necessary directions be issued by providing protection to the petitioners.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that respondent Nos.4 and 5 are natural guardians of petitioner No.2. The petition is founded on bald averments and is not supported by any convincing material. Apart from it, the representation submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.2 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