

120

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

CRWP-6376-2021

Date of decision-12.07.2021

Sahil and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramandeep Singh Sandhu, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India, petitioners have prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for directions to official respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty as they are facing threats from respondent Nos.4 to 7.

As per the facts pleaded in the petition, petitioners being in love decided to marry each other on attaining the marriageable age, but when their relationship came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are parents and other relatives of petitioner No.2, they refused to accept their alliance. They threatened petitioner No.2 and decided to

marry her with a boy of their own choice before attaining the marriageable age as she is minor. Due to fear, on 05.06.2021, petitioner No.2 ran away from her house and contacted petitioner No.1. Now they have decided to reside together in live-in-relationship and will solemnize marriage after attaining the marriageable age. The petitioners have apprehension that private respondents would implicate them in a false criminal case, therefore, a representation dated 06.07.2021 (Annexure P-3) was given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Ferozepur, but no action has been taken on the same. The petitioners have prayed for issuance of necessary directions.

No one has appeared today to assist the Court on behalf of the petitioners.

At this stage, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Harbans Singh states that FIR No.51 dated 10.06.2021 has already been registered under Sections 363, 366 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Cantt, Ferozepur by the Police on the complaint given by the father of the girl (respondent No.4).

Considering the above, this Court finds that 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. It is evident that respondent No.4 has availed a remedy available in law by approaching

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

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

12.07.2021

vanita

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