

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

CRWP-3980-2021

Date of decision-27.04.2021

Sukhwinder Singh and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr.Karandeep S.Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have filed this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of mandamus by way of directions to the official respondent Nos.1 and 2 for providing protection to petitioners as they apprehend danger from private respondent Nos.4 to 11, who are against the matrimonial relations of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners entered into matrimonial alliance willingly on 17.02.2021, but against the wishes of private respondents and therefore, they are receiving threats from them. He submits that in this regard, a representation dated 22.03.2021 (Annexure P-4) was submitted before Senior Superintendent of Police, Ferozepur, however, till date no action has been taken upon the same by the said officer, therefore, they have approached this Court. Learned counsel submits that brother of the

Guruharsahai, who is likely to implicate the petitioners in a false criminal case, therefore, learned counsel prays that necessary directions be issued.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that till date no harm has been caused to the petitioners by any of the private respondents. Further, even if a complaint is given by the private respondents to the police, it cannot be construed as a threat to the petitioners, as the private respondents are well within rights to avail their remedy in law, in case they feel that some offence has been committed. 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

27.04.2021

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No