

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

CRWP-7869-2021

Date of decision-19.08.2021

**Meenakshi Chaudhary and another ...Petitioners
Vs.**

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Barjesh Kumar Sharma, 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.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 to 6 and further restraining them from interfering in their life, as petitioners have solemnized marriage on 16.08.2021 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love 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 6 (parents and brother of petitioner No.1) as they want to marry her with a person of their own choice. He further contends that on 15.08.2021, petitioner No.1 left her house and solemnized marriage with petitioner No.2 at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pitah Patshahi Dasvi, Mohali as per Sikh rites. In this regard

the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. He contends that petitioners have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated 16.08.2021 (Anenxure P-5) has already been given to Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar, however, till date no action has been taken upon the same. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the petition is directed against the parents (natural guardian) and brother of petitioner No.1 and the bald averments contained in the petition are not substantiated with 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.

Apart from it, the representations 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

19.08.2021

vanita

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