

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

CRWP-6403-2021

Date of decision-13.07.2021

Ramandeep Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

The petitioners have filed this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of directions to the official respondent Nos.1 to 3 for providing protection to their life and liberty and further restraining private respondents from interfering in their peaceful life.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that as the petitioners knew each other for last about two years and they decided to marry, however, their alliance was not accepted by the family members of petitioner No.1. According to him, the petitioners performed the marriage with their free will and informed the private respondents, who have extended threats to the petitioners. He has further submitted that they are likely to implicate the petitioners in a false case. Learned counsel has pointed out that in this regard, a representation dated 06.07.2021 (Annexure P-5) has already been submitted to Senior Superintendent of Police, Mohali, however, till date no action has been taken. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the talks regarding compromise between the parties are going

on and there seems a possibility that the parties may arrive at an amicable settlement.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners and considering the above background of this case, this Court is of the opinion that the association of the petitioners is known to private respondents for a long time and prior to the present representation dated 06.07.2021 (Annexure P-5), no complaint whatsoever was made by petitioners to the Police.

A reading of the representation also makes it clear that same is vague and lacking material particulars regarding the alleged threat. Even if it is assumed that the private respondents are likely to lodge a complaint against the petitioners, it cannot be construed as a threat as they are also free to avail their remedy in law in case they feel that some offence has been committed.

Above all, parties are in touch with each other for an amicable settlement, therefore, it is clear that petition is completely misplaced.

Resultantly, no ground is made out for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

13.07.2021
vanita

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