

110

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

CRWP-4330-2021

Date of Decision: 13.05.2021

Sapna and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Viranjeet Singh Mahal, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Article 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 30.04.2021 against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 to 8.

Briefly, the facts pleaded in the writ petition are that the petitioners are major who fell in love with each other and developed relations, therefore, they decided to marry. In this regard, they talked to their respective family members, however, their proposal was not accepted. As a result, the petitioners, who belong to different caste solemnized marriage on 30.04.2021 at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Dasvi at Mohali. Since the petitioners have married against the wishes of the parents and relatives of petitioner No.1, therefore, they are facing threats from them. According to the pleadings, the petitioners submitted a representation dated 03.05.2021 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2 and requested for providing security, but till date their grievance has not been redressed. Hence, this writ petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners are receiving threats from the private respondents, as they have solemnized marriage on 30.04.2021 against their wishes. He has drawn the attention of the Court to the representation dated 03.05.2021 (Annexure P-4) submitted by petitioners to respondent No.2 Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur and contended that no action has been taken by the officer so far. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

After hearing the learned counsel and perusing the petition, this Court finds that the petition was filed on 30.04.2021 and in support, the affidavit of the same date of petitioner No.1 alone has been filed, whereas the representation relied upon by the petitioners is of the subsequent date i.e. 03.05.2021. Learned counsel for the petitioners is unable to explain as to how their pleading regarding submission of representation before respondent No.2 is acceptable on the strength of the affidavit dated 30.04.2021.

Apart from it, the representation is completely vague and does not reveal the relevant and necessary particulars, much less the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. Apparently, the entire case of the petitioners is founded on bald and conflicting averments, therefore, no case is made out for exercise of extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

13.05.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes No
Yes No