

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

CRWP-6784-2021

Date of decision-23.07.2021

**Raman Deep Kaur and another ...Petitioners
Vs.**

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

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

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Through this criminal writ petition, the petitioners are praying for a writ of mandamus by way of directions to the respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 to 6, who are against the alliance of the petitioners and further restraining private respondents from interfering in their personal life and liberty.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners fell in love and decided to live together, however, their alliance was not accepted by the family members of petitioner No.1 as they wanted to marry her with a boy of their own choice. He further argued that the 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 16.07.2021 (Annexure P-3) to Senior Superintendent of Police,

Ferozepur, 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.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that respondent Nos.4 and 5 are natural guardians of petitioner No.1. The petition is founded on bald averments and is not supported by any convincing material. Though it is mentioned in the petition that on two occasions, private respondents came to house of petitioner No.2 and also gave beatings to petitioners, 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.

23.07.2021

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

(MANOJ BAJAJ)

JUDGE

Yes No

Yes No