

117

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-4739-2021

Date of Decision: 24.05.2021

Prabhjot Kaur and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Harsimran Preet Singh, 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 of mandamus by way of directions to official respondents No.1 to 3 for providing protection to their life and liberty, as they apprehend danger from private respondents No.4 to 7, 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 7 (parents and brothers respectively of petitioner No.1). As a result of that, they performed marriage on 20.05.2021 at Gurudwara Guru Nanak Niwas Sahib, Village Karor Kalan, Tehsil Kharar, Distt Mohali 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 20.05.2021 (Annexure P-4) to the Senior

Superintendent of Police (Rural), District Amritsar. 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 petitioners allegedly performed marriage on 20.05.2021 and on the same date, they sent the representation through private courier to respondent No.2 and also filed the petition. It is apparent that the petitioners have acted hastily to approach this Court without pleading any relevant particulars regarding alleged manner and mode of threat. A perusal of the representation reveals that the petitioners made various attempts to convince the private respondents for acceptance of their alliance not only before the marriage, but after the marriage also, which proved to be futile, however, there is nothing on record to indicate that previously any such threat was ever extended by the private respondents to the petitioners when they were making their attempts to convince them.

Admittedly, the petitioners never made any complaint to any authority prior to the marriage and, 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.

24.05.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No