

112

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

CRWP-8855-2021

Date of Decision: 17.09.2021

Jyoti and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Sumit Kalyan, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Articles 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 have solemnized marriage on 13.09.2021 against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 to 18.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners fell in love with each other and developed intimacy, therefore, they decided to marry, but their proposal was opposed by the parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1 Jyoti i.e. respondent Nos.4 to 18, as they wanted to marry her with a boy of their own choice. As a result of that, the petitioners performed marriage on 13.09.2021 at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Dasvi (Retd.), Village Singa Devi, Tehsil Kharar, District Mohali against the wishes of private respondents. After their marriage, the petitioners are receiving serious threats to their life and liberty from the parents of petitioner No.1 and in this regard, petitioners submitted a

representation dated 13.09.2021 (Annexure P-5) to the Senior

Superintendent of Police, Patiala. It is prayed that the petitioners be provided protection.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the petitioners have solemnized marriage on 13.09.2021 at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Dasvi (Retd.), Village Singa Devi, Tehsil Kharar, District Mohali and on the same day, they had sent representation (Annexure P-5) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala through private courier service and on the next day i.e. 14.09.2021, they filed this petition. 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 18.

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 Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala 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.

17.09.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes No
Yes No