

113

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

CRWP-7353-2021

Date of Decision: 06.08.2021

Lovepreet Kaur and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Akashdeep Sethi, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India, petitioners have prayed for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty, as they solemnized marriage on 02.08.2021 against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners, who are major, fell in love with each other and developed relations, therefore, they decided to marry, but their proposal was opposed by private respondents No.4 to 7, who are parents, brother, etc. of petitioner No.1. According to him, the petitioners are receiving threats from them, as they have solemnized marriage on 02.08.2021 against their wishes. He has drawn the attention of the Court to the representation dated 02.08.2021 (Annexure P-5) submitted by petitioners to Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar and contended that no action has been taken by the officer so far. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court

finds that the averments contained in the petition lack the material particulars and do not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension that the private respondents may falsely implicate them in some criminal case, but in the considered opinion of this Court, this apprehension is misplaced, as admittedly, no complaint has been made so far against them by the private respondents.

Apart from above, even, if it is assumed, that a complaint is given to the police by any of the private respondents against the petitioners, then it cannot be construed as threat to their life and liberty, as private respondents are also free to avail their remedy in law in case, they feel that some offence has been committed against them.

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

Dismissed.

06.08.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No