

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**CRWP-5285-2021**

DATE OF DECISION: JUNE 10, 2021

MUSKAN AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF U.T. CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ.**

PRESENT: MR. AMANDEEP SINGH, ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER.

**MANOJ BAJAJ, J.(ORAL)**

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 to 6, who are against the marriage 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 family members of petitioner No.1 opposed their relationship as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. Therefore, on 7.6.2021, the petitioners solemnized marriage at Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir, MDC, Sector 6, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. As per the pleadings, the petitioners have apprehension that the private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, they sent representation dated 7.6.2021 (Annexure P-4) to The Senior Superintendent of Police, U.T, Chandigarh, but no action has been taken upon the same, as so they have approached this Court with a prayer to provide them protection.

He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the representation dated 7.6.2021 (Anexure P-4) was sent to respondent No.2 and the petition was filed on the very next day i.e. 8.6.2021.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that no time has been given to the Sr. Superintendent of Police, U.T., Chandigarh to consider the grievance of the petitioners for redressal. The representation filed by the petitioners also does not contain the material particulars and the manner and mode of the alleged threat extended to them. As per representation, it has been apprehended that the private respondents may involve the petitioners in a false case. Even if it is assumed that the private respondents may give a complaint against the petitioners, it cannot be construed as a threat, as they are also within their rights to avail a remedy in law.

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