

130

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-5023-2021

Date of Decision: 07.06.2021

Priyanka Athwal and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Articles 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 29.05.2021 against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners fell in love with each other and developed relations, therefore, they decided to marry, but their proposal was opposed by the parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1 Priyanka Athwal i.e. respondent Nos.4 to 7. According to him, the petitioners are receiving threats from the private respondents, as they have solemnized marriage on 29.05.2021 against their wishes. He has drawn the attention of the Court to the representation dated 29.05.2021 (Annexure P-5) submitted by petitioners to Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar and contended that no action has been taken by the officer so far. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the petitioners have solemnized marriage on 29.05.2021 at Shri

Parshuram Mandir, Krishna Colony, Yamuna Nagar and on the same day, they had sent representation (Annexure P-5) to Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar through private courier service and filed this petition on 30.05.2021. In the petition, neither any specific threat or allegation has been attributed to any of the respondents nor any convincing material has been brought on record to substantiate the ground. Admittedly, the private respondents were opposing the alliance of the petitioners, but previously in this regard, no complaint was ever made to the police by the petitioners, against private respondents No.4 to 7.

The sequence of events pleaded by the petitioners do not seem to be probable, therefore, the prayer made by the learned counsel for issuance of directions to Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar to look into their representation is also not worth acceptance, as their representation also lacks necessary particulars regarding manner and mode of alleged threat.

Resultantly, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

07.06.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes	No
Yes	No