

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

CRWP-8250-2021

Date of decision-01.09.2021

Neha and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Bhavdeep Singh Mamli, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Aakash Juneja, Advocate for respondent No.4.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Through this criminal writ petition, the petitioners are praying for issuance of directions to the respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 to 7, who are against the alliance of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love decided to marry each other on attaining the marriageable age, but their alliance was not accepted by private respondents, who are parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1, as they want to marry her with a person of their own choice. Petitioner No.1 again tried to convince her parents for marriage, but they refused to accept their proposal, therefore, petitioner No.1 ran away from her house and joined the company of petitioner No.2 and living together

since 25.08.2021 at Village Barna, District Kurukshetra (house of petitioner No.2). Petitioners have apprehension that private respondents would cause harm to them as on 24.08.2021, parents of petitioner No.1 visited the house of petitioner No.2 and extended threats of dire consequences, therefore, a representation dated 25.08.2021 (Annexure P-3) was given to Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, 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. 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.

01.09.2021

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Yes	No
Yes	No