120

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-7302-2021
Date of decision-05.08.2021

Anita Thakur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

U.T.Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Krishan Kumar Thakur, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Anupam Bansal, Addl.P.P.U.T.Chandigarh.

***

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioners have filed this criminal writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of directions to the official respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 and 5 as petitioners have solemnized marriage on 02.08.2021 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners being known to each other for the six months fell in love and decided to marry. When the relationship of the petitioners came into the knowledge of private respondents (parents of petitioner No.1) they turned against their alliance as they wanted to solemnize her

VANITA
2021.08.11 11:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

marriage with a boy of their choice. Private respondents started giving threats to the petitioners of dire consequences. Therefore, due to fear and compelling circumstances, petitioner No.1 left her house and on 02.08.2021 solemnized marriage with petitioner No.2 at Vedic Poojan Kender, MDC, Sector-4, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. Learned counsel further submits that petitioners have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated 02.08.2021 (Anenxure P-5) has already been given to Senior Superintendent of Police, U.T.Chandigarh, however, till date no action has been taken upon the same. 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. 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.

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.

At this stage, learned counsel appearing on behalf of

VANITA
2021.08.11 11:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

U.T.Chandigarh has apprised that the statements of respondent No.4 (father of petitioner No.1) and Goverdhan Singh (father of petitioner No.2) have been recorded, wherein they have stated that they have no objection to the alleged marriage of the petitioners.

In view of the above, no ground is made out for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

05.08.2021
vanita

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

VANITA
2021.08.11 11:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document