

116

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

CRWP-7448-2021

Date of Decision: 09.08.2021

Annu and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Kanwar Arun Singh, 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 06.08.2021 against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 to 8.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners fell in love with each other and developed relations, therefore, they decided to marry, but their proposal was opposed by private respondent Nos.4 to 8 (parents, brother and cousin brothers of petitioner No.1), as they wanted to marry Annu with a boy of their own choice. According to him, the petitioners are receiving threats from them, as they have solemnized marriage on 06.08.2021 at Pracheen Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir (Regd.) M.D.C., Sector-6, Panchkula against their wishes. He has drawn the attention of the Court to the representation dated 06.08.2021 (Annexure P-5) submitted by petitioners to Superintendent of Police, District Sirsa, Haryana and contended that no action has been taken by the officer so far.

He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the petitioners have solemnized marriage on 06.08.2021 and on the same date, they sent the representation through private courier to respondent No.2 and also filed the petition. It is apparent that the petitioners have acted hastily to approach this Court. In the petition, neither any specific threat or allegation has been attributed to any of the respondents nor any convincing material has been brought on record to substantiate the ground. Admittedly, the private respondents were opposing the alliance of the petitioners, but previously in this regard, no complaint was ever made to the police by the petitioners, against private respondents No.4 to 8.

The sequence of events pleaded by the petitioners do not seem to be probable, therefore, the prayer made by the learned counsel for issuance of directions to Superintendent of Police, Sirsa to look into their representation is also not worth acceptance, as their representation also lacks necessary particulars regarding manner and mode of alleged threat.

Resultantly, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

09.08.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes	No
Yes	No