

119

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

CRWP-7064-2021

Date of decision-29.07.2021

Pooja and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Ms. Anu Garg, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. G.S.Dhillon, Advocate for respondent Nos.4 to 10.

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.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 to 10 and further restraining them from interfering in their life.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being known to each other 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 10 (parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1). On 26.07.2021 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. He further argued that after marriage, private respondents threatened petitioners telephonically that they will not let them live peacefully, therefore, they sent representations dated 26.07.2021 (Annexures P-5 and P-6) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur and to Station House Officer, Sangrur, respectively, 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 26.07.2021 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 27.07.2021.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that even before the representation sent by the petitioners could reach the office of Superintendent of Police, Sangrur 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. 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 representations submitted by the petitioners to respondent Nos.2 and 3 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

29.07.2021

vanita

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