

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

CRWP-6291-2021

Date of decision-09.07.2021

Raman Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr.Tribhawan Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

The petitioners have filed this criminal writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for directions to the official respondent Nos.2 and 3 for protection of their life and liberty from private respondent No.4, who is against the matrimonial relations of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners solemnized marriage on 05.07.2021 at Gurudwara, Barnala as per sikh rites against the wishes of respondent No.4, who is brother of petitioner No.1. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. As per the pleadings, after the marriage, private respondent, who is having close links with political leaders & influential person, threatened petitioners of dire consequences and petitioners have apprehension that he will implicate them in a false

case. Therefore, they sent representation dated 05.07.2021 (Annexure P-5) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Barnala, 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 representation further reveals that admittedly, the alleged marriage of the petitioners is not even opposed by their respective parents, but respondent No.4 is opposing their alliance. 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 respondent would implicate them in a false criminal case, cannot be construed as a threat as he is also 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