

117

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

CRWP-4810-2021

Date of Decision: 26.05.2021

Ramandeep Kaur and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Sandeep K. Bansal, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of a writ by way of directions to official respondents No.2 and 3 for providing protection to their life and liberty, as they apprehend danger from private respondents No.4 to 11, who are opposing their marriage.

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, but their proposal was opposed by private respondents No.4 to 11. As a result of that, they performed marriage on 12.05.2021 at Arya Samaj Vedic Sanskar Trust ((Regd.) Vishwas Nagar, Sadra, New Delhi, against the wishes of private respondents. After their marriage, the petitioners are receiving serious threats to their life and liberty from the family members of petitioner No.1 and in this regard, they submitted a representation dated 18.05.2021 (Annexure P-4) to the Senior

Superintendent of Police Bathinda. It is prayed that the petitioners be provided protection.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that though the proposal of marriage was discussed with the private respondents, but they remained adamant on their decision and turned down the request of the petitioners and faced with the situation, they had no alternative, but to perform marriage against their wishes. He submits that though the representation has been given to respondent No.2, but till date no protection has been provided to the petitioners, therefore, necessary directions be issued for providing protection to them.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the averments contained in the petition and representation lack the material particulars and do not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension in the representation that the private respondents may falsely implicate the petitioners in some criminal case and in the considered opinion of this Court, this apprehension is misplaced, as admittedly, no complaint has been made so far against them by the private respondents No.4 to 11. Even, if it is assumed, that a complaint is given to the police by any of the private respondents against the petitioners, then it cannot be construed as threat to their life and liberty, as private respondents are also free to avail their remedy in law in case, they feel that some offence has been committed.

Admittedly, the petitioners never made any complaint to any authority prior to their marriage, therefore, this Court finds that the bald averments made in the petition as well as in the representation are not worth acceptance.

Resultantly, no ground is made out for exercise of extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

26.05.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No