

respondent No.4 threatened petitioners of dire consequences and they have apprehension that private respondent will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated 18.08.2021 (Annexure P-5) has already been given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Hoshiarpur, but no action has been taken upon the same, so they have approached this Court with a prayer to provide them protection. She prays that appropriate direction be issued.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the petitioners are 44 years and 33 years old, respectively, and the respondent No.4 is also 47 years old, who is elder to petitioner No.1 and is already married. She further concedes that it is the second marriage of petitioner No.1.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the bald averments contained in the petition are not substantiated with any convincing material. Apart from it, a perusal of the representation dated 18.08.2021 (Annexure P-5) reveals that the petitioner No.1 has only conveyed to official respondent No.2 about the solemnization of the alleged marriage and threat faced by them. The contents of the representation do not contain the relevant particulars much less the mode and manner of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. Strangely, there is no mention of respondent No.4 in the representation, therefore, the pleadings in the petition do not inspire confidence.

Admittedly, neither any case has been registered so far nor any complaint has been given against the petitioners, and even if it is assumed that a complaint is given against the petitioners, it cannot be construed as

threat.

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

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

27.10.2021

vanita

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