

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

CRWP-6296-2021

Date of decision-09.07.2021

Manpreet Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Bharat Bhushan, 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.2 and 3 for protection of their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 to 9, who are against the matrimonial relations of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners being known to each other for the last two years, fell in love and decided to marry. When the relationship of the petitioners came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1 respectively, they refused to accept their alliance. Therefore, petitioners ran away from their respective houses and solemnized marriage on 05.07.2021 at Shri Aadi Shakti Ved Pathshala, MDC, Sector-4, Panchkula. 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. The private respondents are narrow minded persons and they have refused to accept the marriage of the petitioners despite convincing efforts made by them. Therefore, they sent representation dated 06.07.2021 (Annexure P-4) to 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 petition reveals that marriage was performed on 05.07.2021 and thereafter, the petitioners sent representation on 06.07.2021 by post to respondent No.2 and the petition was filed on the very next day i.e 07.07.2021.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the representation sent by the petitioners did not even reach the office of Superintendent of Police, but the petitioners filed the petition on the very next day. It is evident that no time was given to the Superintendent of Police, Barnala (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