

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

CRWP-7754-2021

Date of decision-17.08.2021

Pinky Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Rajesh Duhan, 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.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 to 7, who are against the alliance of the petitioners and further restraining private respondents from interfering in their peaceful life. It has been further prayed that representation dated 12.08.2021 (Annexure P-3) be decided.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being known to each other for the last two years, fell in love and decided to marry each other on attaining the marriageable age, but when their relationship came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are parents and brothers of petitioner No.1, they refused to accept their alliance. They threatened and gave beatings to petitioner No.1 and hurriedly started making arrangements to marry her with a person of

their own choice. Therefore, petitioner No.1 ran away from her house on 12.08.2021, and contacted petitioner No.2, who made call to private respondents and requested to allow them to solemnize marriage, but private respondents extended threats of dire consequences. Therefore, petitioners decided to reside together till petitioner No.2 attains the statutory marriageable age. Petitioners have apprehension that private respondents would cause harm to them and they would implicate them in a false criminal case, therefore, a representation dated 12.08.2021 (Annexure P-3) was given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, but no action has been taken on 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. 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	
17.08.2021	Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
vanita	Whether Reportable :	Yes	No