

CRWP-6658-2021
Date of decision-19.07.2021

State of Punjab and others **...Respondents**

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

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners fell in love and decided to solemnize marriage and when they expressed their decision to the parents of petitioner No.1, the same was not accepted by private respondent Nos.4 to 7 (parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1), who gave severe beatings to her and as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice, therefore, she left her house on 14.07.2021 and petitioners solemnized

marriage at Pracheen Pashupati Nath, Shiv Mander, M.D.C, Sector-6, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. As per the pleadings, private respondents threatened petitioners of dire consequences and they have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, they sent representation dated 14.07.2021 (Annexure P-5) to Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar, but no action has been taken upon the same, so they have approached this Court with a prayer to provide them protection. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

A perusal of the petition reveals that the alleged marriage was performed by the petitioners on 14.07.2021 and thereafter, they sent representation on the same day by post to respondent No.2 and filed this petition on the very next day i.e 15.07.2021.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that even before the representation sent by the petitioners could reach the office of Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar or considered by the said officer, the petitioners have filed this petition seeking a writ of mandamus, that too without making out any case of imminent threat or danger to their life. Though it is mentioned in the petition that previously also beatings were given to petitioner No.1, but admittedly no complaint was made to the police. 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.

Apart from it, the representation submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.2 also lacks material particulars and does not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners.

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

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

19.07.2021

vanita

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