

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-5055-2021 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION: JUNE 10, 2021

MANISH AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ.

PRESENT: MR. R.S. JOSHI,, ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONERS.
KANWAR SANJIV KUMAR, AAG, HARYANA.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.(ORAL)

CRM-W-678-2021

This is an application for placing on record photographs
(Annexure P-6) and Marriage Certificate (Annexure P-7).

The same are taken on record.

Application is allowed.

CRWP-5055-2021

The petitioners have filed this petition under Article 226
Constitution of India for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to
protect their life and liberty, as they apprehend danger from respondents
No.4 and 8, who are against the relations of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the
petitioners fell in love with each other and decided to marry. However, the
private respondents, who are the father and other relatives of petitioner
No.1, who opposed their relationship as they wanted to solemnize her
marriage with a boy of their choice. Therefore, on 20.5.2021, petitioner
No.1 left her house and joined the company of petitioner No.2 and are living

in live-in relationship since then. The petitioners apprehend that the private respondents would cause harm to them, therefore, they submitted a representation dated 20.5.2021 (Annexure P-4) to the Superintendent of Police, Sirsa, whereupon no action has been taken. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners has stated that the petitioners have performed marriage on 4.6.2021 at Shiv Durga Mandir, Sector 19, Panchkula according to Hindu rites and has drawn the attention of Court to the photographs (Annexure P-6) and Marriage Certificate (Annexure P-7).

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court is of the opinion that the facts and circumstances of the case do not indicate existence of any 'actual' threat to the petitioners, as it is not mentioned in the representation that private respondents ever contacted or met the petitioners. The representation dated 20.5.2021 (Annexure P-4) is vague and does not reveal the alleged manner or mode of threat extended to the petitioners. The recent development of their marriage further establishes the fact that they are moving freely and the claim raised in this petition is misconceived.

Resultantly, no case is made out for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

June 10, 2021
Gulati

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Reportable : Yes/No

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No