

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

CRWP-6974-2021

Date of decision-28.07.2021

**Komalpreet Kaur and another ...Petitioners
Vs.**

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Virender 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 and 5, as they have entered into marriage on 24.07.2021 against their wishes. It has been further prayed that directions be issued to not to implicate petitioner No.2 and his family members in false criminal case.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love 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 and 5 (parents of petitioner No.1) as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. They gave severe beatings to petitioner No.1 and refused to accept their relationship despite convincing efforts and threatened

them to eliminate. Therefore, on 24.07.2021, petitioner No.1 left her house and solemnized marriage with petitioner No.2 at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi, Singa Devi, Kharar Mohali as per Sikh rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. He has 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 24.07.2021 (Annexure P-5) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur, 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 private respondents gave beatings to petitioner No.1, but admittedly no complaint was made by her 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	
28.07.2021	Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
vanita	Whether Reportable :	Yes	No