

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

CRWP-6292-2021

Date of decision-09.07.2021

Gurpreet Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State 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 to 6, who are against the matrimonial relations of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners being known to each other fell in love and decided to marry, but private respondents, who are parents and brother of petitioner No.1 respectively, refused to accept their alliance. On 05.07.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Gurudwara Jalandhar. As per the pleadings, after the marriage, private respondents threatened petitioners of dire consequences and petitioners have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case. Therefore, they sent

representation dated 05.07.2021 (Annexure P-4) to Commissioner of Police, Luchiana, but no action has been taken upon the same, so they have approached this Court. He prays that the necessary directions be issued to official respondents for providing protection to the petitioners.

A perusal of the petition reveals that marriage was performed on 05.07.2021 and thereafter, the petitioners sent representation on 05.07.2021 by post to respondent No.2 and the petition was filed on the very next day i.e 06.07.2021.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the representation sent by the petitioners did not even reach the office of Commissioner of Police, but the petitioners filed the petition on the very next day. It is evident that no time was given to the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana (respondent No.2) to consider the grievance of the petitioners for redressal. Moreover, it is not disputed by learned counsel that respondent Nos.4 and 5 are 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. Further, the apprehension of the petitioners that private respondents would implicate them in a false criminal case,

cannot be construed as a threat as they too are free to avail their remedy in law.

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

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

09.07.2021
vanita

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