

131

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

CRWP-3912-2021

Date of Decision: 23.04.2021

Kamaljit Kaur and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Ms. Shivangi, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Articles 226 Constitution of India, petitioners have prayed for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty, as they have solemnized marriage on 21.04.2021 against the wishes of private respondent No.4.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners were in love with each other and decided to get married. Their relation is being opposed by respondent No.4 (father of petitioner No.1) and, therefore, they ran away to perform the marriage. Learned counsel has invited the attention of the Court to the marriage certificate and photographs (Annexures P-3 and P-4) respectively to contend that the petitioners performed marriage on 21.04.2021. He contends that both are major, but their matrimonial relation is being opposed by the private respondent No.4. He submits that a representation (Annexure P-5) has been given to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur, however, till date, the officer has not acted upon the same, therefore, the necessary directions be issued to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the representation (Annexure P-5) is dated 15.04.2021 i.e. before the alleged marriage between the petitioners. As per the representation, the brother of the applicant No.1 (Rohit s/o Devraj) is against the marriage, whereas in the subject of the representation, the allegations are against Amarjit Singh, who is father of petitioner No.2. The brother of petitioner No.1 is neither named in representation nor he is a party in the petition and the averments contained in the representation are also vague and without any material particulars. Besides, the petitioners allegedly ran away from the house and performed marriage on 21.04.2021 without any hindrance much less from respondent No.4, therefore, the grievance raised by the petitioners in the petition does not inspire confidence.

Resultantly, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

23.04.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No