

118

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

CRWP-6169-2021

Date of Decision: 06.07.2021

Vikramjit Singh

.. Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

This criminal writ petition has been filed by petitioner under Article 226 Constitution of India seeking a writ of mandamus by way of directions to respondent No.2 to consider his application dated 03.07.2021 (Annexure P-2) and not to harass him and his parents at the instance of respondent Nos.4 to 6, who are close relatives of respondent No.7, and further to protect his life and liberty.

Learned counsel has argued that private respondents No.4 and 5 (parents of respondent No.7-Manisha Rani) have always neglected their daughter and only paid attention to their son Nachttar Singh (respondent No.6). According to him, respondent No.7 is desirous to marry petitioner, but the parents are opposing their relationship and want to marry her with a boy of their own choice. He submits that respondent No.7 has voluntarily joined the company of petitioner, therefore, he has an apprehension that parents of Manisha Rani can disturb his peaceful life. In this regard, he has given a representation dated 03.07.2021 (Annexure P-2) to the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, but according to him, no action has been

taken upon the same, therefore, he prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the police officials have been visiting his house, who are looking for the daughter of respondent Nos.4 and 5. However, the representation does not contain the relevant or necessary particulars regarding any threat to the petitioner and apparently, the petition is founded on misapprehension. Apart from it, even if it is assumed that the parents of the minor girl are approaching the police on a ground that some offence has been committed by the petitioner, then they are well within their rights to seek their remedy in law, and it cannot be construed as a harassment or disturbance in the peaceful life of the petitioner.

Resultantly, no ground is made out for exercising the extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

06.07.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No