

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

**CRWP-8675-2021**

**Date of decision-13.09.2021**

**Seema and another**

**...Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**State of Haryana and others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ**

Present: Mr. Gautam Kaile, 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 9, as they have entered into marriage on 07.09.2021 against their wishes and further for restraining the respondent Nos.4 to 9 from interfering in their life.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love decided to solemnize marriage, but family members of petitioner No.1 were against their alliance, therefore, on 07.09.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir Society, MDC, Sector-4, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-5) are appended with the petition. He has further argued that the private respondents threatened

petitioners of dire consequences and they have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated 07.09.2021 (Annexure P-6) has already been given to Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, but no action has been taken upon the same, so they have approached this Court with a prayer to provide them protection. 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. Further, the representation dated 07.09.2021 (Annexure P-6) was sent to respondent No.2 through postal receipt dated 07.09.2021 and the petition was filed on the very next day i.e 08.09.2021. It is evident that the representation sent by the petitioners did not even reach the office of Superintendent of Police, but the petitioners filed the petition on the next day. It is clear that no time was given to the Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar (respondent No.2) to consider the grievance of the petitioners for redressal. 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.

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.

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

Dismissed.

13.09.2021

vanita

(MANOJ BAJAJ)  
JUDGE

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