

115

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

CRWP-3774-2021

Date of Decision: 22.04.2021

Baby and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Ms. Jainika Jain, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Hashit Jain, Advocate for the private respondents.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

This Criminal Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 Constitution of India seeking issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that as the petitioners entered into marriage against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 to 7, therefore, they are extending threats to the petitioners. Learned counsel has invited the attention of the Court to the representation dated 15.04.2021 (Annexure P-4) to contend that respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala has not taken any action upon the representation of the petitioners, therefore, they have approached this Court by way of the present writ petition. She prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners that after their marriage on 15.04.2021, they

avoided to face the private respondents, but it is apprehended that since the marriage is against their wishes, they would cause harm to them.

At this stage, Mr. Harshit Jain, learned counsel appears on behalf of private respondents and contends that a complaint has already been given by father of petitioner No.1 to the police, whereupon a case FIR No.37 dated 15.04.2021, under Section 346 IPC at Police Station Sanaur, District Patiala has been registered.

After considering the above, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners have not mentioned the relevant particulars in their representation regarding the alleged threat by the private respondents and, therefore, their stand is not worth acceptance. On the contrary, as per the learned counsel for the private respondents, it is evident that the private respondents have adopted a remedy available in law and, therefore, it cannot be construed as a threat to the petitioners.

In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

22.04.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes	No
Yes	No