

114

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRWP-5831-2021

Date of decision-28.06.2021

Parwinder Kaur and another

....Petitioners

Vs.

State of of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. L.S.Lakhanpal, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

The petitioners have filed this criminal writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of directions to the official respondent Nos.1 to 3 for protection of their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 and 5, who are opposing their live-in-relationship.

As per the facts pleaded in the petition, petitioners being in love decided to marry each other on attaining the marriageable age, but when their relationship came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are father and uncle 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. Due to fear, petitioner No.1 ran away from her house on 21.06.2021, and contacted petitioner No.2. They decided

to reside together in live-in-relationship till the petitioner No.2 attains the marriageable age. The private respondents extended threats to the petitioners that they would implicate them in a false criminal case, therefore, a representation dated 22.06.2021 (Annexure P-3) was given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, but no action has been taken on the same. The petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary directions.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that as petitioner No.2 has not attained the statutory marriageable age, so they have not solemnized the marriage, but the parents of the girl have not accepted their relation, who are hurriedly making arrangements to marry her with a person of their own choice. According to him, petitioner No.1 ran away from her house and started residing with petitioner No.2 w.e.f.21.06.2021 and the grievance of the petitioners conveyed through the representation to respondent No.2 has not been addressed so far. He prays that the necessary directions be issued to official respondents for providing protection to the petitioners.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that respondent No.4 is natural guardian of petitioner No.1 and the petition is founded on bald averments, which is not supported by any convincing material. Apart from it, the representation submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.2 also lacks necessary particulars and

is vague, as it does not even reveal the manner and 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.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

28.06.2021
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No