

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

CRWP-3892-2021

Date of Decision: 23.04.2021

ASHA PATIDAR AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Imran Farooqi, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Article 226/227 the petitioners have prayed for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus for directing the respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the private respondents who are opposing the live-in-relationship of the petitioners.

As per the facts pleaded in the petition, petitioners met each other in a party about two years back, who fell in love and decided to get married. Both petitioners being major are in a live-in relationship and living together, but when they informed their relatives about their decision to marry each other, the private respondents started opposing their relation and threatened to kill them. According to petitioners this approach is very conservative, orthodox and fanatic. The petitioner No.1 is doing job in a private company, who earns Rs. 20,000/- per month and as such she is in a position to bear the burden of matrimonial life. The petitioners gave representation dated 14.04.2021 (Annexure P-3) to

respondent No.2 for protection of their life or liberty, but till date no

action has been taken upon the same. Hence this petition.

Learned counsel contends that petitioners have decided to marry each other, but as the parents of the petitioner No.1 are against the alliance, therefore, they are apprehending threat to their life. The petitioners are running here and there for their safety, and as they have no safe place to live, therefore, the petitioners be protected.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that respondent Nos.4 and 6 are parents and brother, respectively of the petitioner No.1. 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

23.04.2021

monika*

Whether speaking / reasoned? Yes No

Whether reportable? Yes No