

114

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-5894-2021

Date of Decision: 29.06.2021

Meeku and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Sukhdeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India, petitioners seek a writ of mandamus by way of directions to official respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty from respondent Nos.4 to 8, as they are against petitioners' live-in-relationship.

Briefly, the facts pleaded in the writ petition are that the petitioners are major, who fell in love with each other and developed relations and decided to marry, but when their relationship came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are parents and brothers of petitioner No.1, they refused to accept their alliance. They threatened petitioner No.1 and decided to marry her with a boy of their own choice, so petitioner No.1 ran away from her house and contacted petitioner No.2. Since then, both the petitioners are residing together in live-in-relationship.

The private respondents extended threats to the petitioners that they would

implicate them in a false criminal case, therefore, a representation dated 21.06.2021 (Annexure P-3) was given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, but till date, no action has been taken upon it. The petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary directions.

Learned counsel contends that petitioners are major and have decided to marry each other, but as the parents of the petitioner No.1 are against this alliance, therefore, they are apprehending threat to their life. He has further contended that the parents of the petitioner No.1 were compelling her for marriage with a person of their choice, so petitioner No.1 ran away and started residing with petitioner No.2. He submits that the grievance of the petitioners conveyed through the representation to respondent No.2 has not been addressed so far, therefore, the necessary directions be issued by providing protection to the petitioners.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the averments contained in the petition lack the material particulars and do not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension that the private respondents may falsely implicate the petitioners in some criminal case and in the considered opinion of this Court, this apprehension is misplaced, as admittedly, no complaint has been made so far against them by the private respondents. Even, if it is assumed, that a complaint is given to the police by any of the private respondents against the petitioners, then it cannot be construed as threat to their life and liberty, as private respondents are also free to avail their remedy in law in case, they feel that some offence has been committed.

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for

exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

29.06.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No