

113

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

**CRWP-8911-2021**

**Date of Decision: 17.09.2021**

**Shama Parveen @ Shama Jain and another**

**.. Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others**

**..Respondents**

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

Present: Mr. Jashanjot Singh Uppal, 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 solemnized marriage on 14.09.2021 against the wishes of private respondent No.4.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners knew each other for the last one year and have good understanding, therefore, they decided to marry against the wishes of parents of petitioner No.2. They solemnized marriage on 14.09.2021 as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. Immediately after performing the marriage, both the petitioners apprised this to their families. The parents of petitioner No.2 agreed after initial hesitation and gave their consent to this marriage, however, when the father of petitioner No.1 (respondent No.4) came to know about this marriage, he threatened them, as he wanted to preform the marriage of petitioner No.1 with a boy of his own choice. According to him, the petitioners are receiving threats from him, as they have solemnized marriage against his wishes. He submits that there is every likelihood that

the private respondent No.4 would implicate the petitioners in some false case by giving a complaint to the police. He has invited the attention of the Court to the representation dated 14.09.2021 (Annexure P-5) and contended that till date, no protection has been provided and further prays for issuance of necessary directions.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the averments contained in the petition lack the material particulars and do not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension that private respondent No.4 may falsely implicate them in some criminal case, but in the considered opinion of this Court, this apprehension is misplaced, as admittedly, no complaint has been made so far against them by private respondent No.4.

Apart from above, even, if it is assumed, that a complaint is given to the police by any of the private respondent against the petitioners, then it cannot be construed as threat to their life and liberty, as private respondent is also free to avail his remedy in law in case, he feels that some offence has been committed against him.

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

Dismissed.

17.09.2021  
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes No  
Yes No