

116

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

CRWP-6592-2021

Date of Decision: 16.07.2021

Mahak Bahna Khan and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Aanand Kumar Maurya, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India, petitioners have prayed for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty, as they solemnized marriage on 07.07.2021 against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 and 5.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners fell in love with each other and developed relations, therefore, they decided to marry, but their proposal was opposed by private respondent Nos.4 and 5 (parents of petitioner No.1). According to him, the petitioners are receiving threats from them, as they have solemnized marriage on 07.07.2021 against their wishes. He has drawn the attention of the Court to the representation dated 08.07.2021 (Annexure P-5) submitted by petitioners to Assistant Commissioner of Police, Panchkula and contended that no action has been taken by the officer so far. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned

counsel that the petitioners have solemnized marriage (nikah) on 07.07.2021

and on the next day i.e. 08.07.2021, they had sent representation (Annexure P-5) to Assistant Commissioner of Police, Panchkula. In the petition, neither any specific threat or allegation has been attributed to any of the respondents nor any convincing material has been brought on record to substantiate the ground. Admittedly, the private respondents were opposing the alliance of the petitioners, but previously in this regard, no complaint was ever made to the police by the petitioners, against private respondents No.4 and 5.

The sequence of events pleaded by the petitioners do not seem to be probable, therefore, the prayer made by the learned counsel for issuance of directions to Assistant Commissioner of Police, Panchkula to look into their representation is also not worth acceptance, as their representation also lacks necessary particulars regarding manner and mode of alleged threat.

Resultantly, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

16.07.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes	No
Yes	No