

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-5297-2021

DATE OF DECISION: JUNE 10, 2021

KAJAL AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ.

PRESENT: MR. BALKAR 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.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty, as they apprehend danger from respondents No.4 and 5, 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 live with each other in live-in relationship. However, the private respondents, who are the parents of petitioner No.1 opposed their relationship as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. Therefore, in the month of December, 2020, 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-3) to the Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, whereupon no action has been taken. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

After hearing the learned counsel, this Court finds that as per the stand of the petitioners, the girl left her parents' home in December, 2020 and since then they are residing together. The apprehension of threat as expressed in representation (Annexure P-3) is after six months after the girl left the company of her parents and does not disclose as to how this apprehension erupted. The petition is founded on bald averments and is not supported by any convincing material. Apart from it, the representation submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.2 does not reveal the manner or mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners.

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

June 10, 2021
Gulati

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Reportable : Yes/No

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No